

Renaissance Crusaders: Humanist Crusade Literature in the Age of Mehmed II

JAMES HANKINS

To Paul Oskar Kristeller on his ninetieth birthday

I. HUMANIST CRUSADING LITERATURE

There is something incongruous, on the face of it, about combining in the title of this essay the humanist movement with the Crusades. In the popular historical imagination crusading is inseparably linked with the High Middle Ages—with Urban II and Peter the Hermit, Bohemond and Godfrey of Bouillon, St. Bernard and the military orders, Richard the Lionhearted, and Saladin. The failed crusades of the fifteenth century it is hard to think of as anything but the last twitchings of a decayed and discredited tradition. Renaissance humanists, on the other hand, have become in recent historical literature almost the shock troops of modernity: the cultural innovators whose methods and outlook heralded modern political discourse, the Reformation, historicism, and secularism. They are commonly described as belonging to a (mostly) lay movement, hostile to the medieval past, committed to the cultural values of Greco-Roman antiquity, and largely supported by the same emergent secular powers whose particular interests worked consistently against any pan-European crusading projects in the later Middle Ages. The humanist model of military virtue is held to be that of the citizen-soldier, not the Christian knight; Cincinnatus, not St. Louis.¹ The student who approaches the humanist movement equipped only with the historiographical prejudices of the moment would not expect humanists and crusaders to have much common ground.² But in fact—as well-informed historians have long known—there is an enormous body of humanist cru-

I should like to thank my colleagues Daniel Gordan, C. P. Jones, Cemal Kafadar, Edward L. Keenan, and Angeliki Laiou for various suggestions.

¹See C. C. Bayley, *War and Society in Renaissance Florence* (Toronto, 1963), and M. Mallett, *Mercenaries and Their Masters* (London, 1974).

²See, for example, R. W. Southern's otherwise admirable study, *Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, Mass., 1962), 90 f, for his view that Pius II's crusade writings are lacking in sincerity.

sading literature, most of it strongly favorable toward the crusading projects of the period.³ The humanists wrote far more often and at far greater length about the Turkish menace and the need for crusade than they did about such better-known humanist themes as true nobility, liberal education, the dignity of man, or the immortality of the soul.

Though it is not obvious why the humanists should have spent so much time advocating crusade, it is easy to think of rhetorical strategies to reduce the apparent incongruity. One could maintain that humanism is a more "medieval" phenomenon than is usually thought. One could take the opposite tack and argue that crusading, the sanctification of violence, is an essential part of European military culture and cannot be confined to the period of the High Middle Ages; that the humanists promoted crusading because it was an inescapable part of their world. Yet neither of these strategies promises to tell us much in the end about the curious preoccupation of humanists with crusading in the second half of the fifteenth century. Worse, they threaten to involve us in the issue of periodization, than which no issue can be more useless and tedious. A better way to proceed is to ask what distinguishes humanist crusading literature from medieval crusading literature. How did the humanists transform the themes and genres of crusading literature? What happened to a "medieval" ideal when it became material for a "Renaissance" cultural movement? The answers to these questions may help explain why the humanists felt compelled to write about crusading. At the least, they have the merit of forcing us to take a closer look at what the humanists actually wrote about the Crusades and the Turkish threat.

Though humanist writings on the Crusades and the Ottoman Turks commence with Petrarch in the fourteenth century, the bulk of humanist crusading literature begins only after the fall of Constantinople in 1453. Thereafter, it tends to come in waves, with the Council of Mantua in 1458, the fall of Negroponte in 1470, the capture of Otranto in 1480, and so forth, down to the battle of Lepanto in 1571. In this essay I shall concern myself only with works written during the reign of Mehmed II (1451–81), a literature composed almost entirely by Italians.

Some convergence between the Crusades and the humanist movement can be achieved *a priori*, as it were, by taking a closer look at the special characteristics of crusading in the late Middle Ages.⁴ The most obvious difference between the crusades of the

³For bibliographical information on humanist crusading literature in the fifteenth century, see R. Schwoebel, *The Shadow of the Crescent: The Renaissance Image of the Turk (1453–1517)* (New York, 1967); A. Pertusi, *La caduta di Constantinopoli*, 2 vols. (Verona, 1976); *Gli umanisti e la guerra otrantina: Testi dei secoli XV e XVI*, ed. L. Gualdo Rosa, I. Nuoro, and D. Defilippis, intro. F. Tateo (Bari, 1982); A. Pertusi, *Testi inediti e poco noti sulla caduta di Constantinopoli*, ed. A. Carile (Bologna, 1983); R. Black, *Benedetto Accolti and the Florentine Renaissance* (Cambridge, 1985), 226–41; L. Schmügge, *Die Kreuzzüge aus der Sicht humanistischer Geschichtsschreiber* (Basle, 1987). It should be emphasized that none of these studies is based on an exhaustive knowledge of the manuscript and printed sources, which have yet to be thoroughly surveyed. For the period covered by this article, 1451–81, for example, I have collected more than 400 texts written by more than 50 humanists, and this material is by no means complete. A few of the more interesting unpublished items are presented below in the appendix of texts.

⁴For the later crusades, see *A History of the Crusades*, ed. K. M. Setton, 2nd ed., II (Madison, Wisc., 1964); K. M. Setton, *The Papacy and the Levant (1204–1571)*, 4 vols. = MAPS, vols. 114, 127, 161–62 (Philadelphia, 1976–84); N. Housley, *The Later Crusades: From Lyons to Alcazar, 1274–1580* (Oxford, 1992).

fifteenth century and those of the so-called classical period of crusading—from the Council of Clermont in 1095 to the fall of Acre in 1291—is the absence in the later period of strong leadership on the part of secular princes. In the classical period, the kings of France had made common cause with the popes against the infidel; in the quattrocento, crusading popes from Eugene IV to Sixtus IV looked in vain for a princely champion. Janos Hunyadi of Hungary won some glorious victories but was too weak to challenge the Turk beyond his own kingdom, while the dukes of Burgundy, despite generous promises, in the end proved invertibrate. The absence of strong secular leadership was an outward sign of a less visible change that had overtaken Europe since the thirteenth century, namely the maturation of the European nation-states. The Crusades of the High Middle Ages from one point of view could be seen as a failed attempt on the part of the papacy to establish a monopoly of the means of violence within Christendom. By the fifteenth century this monopoly was clearly passing to Europe's secular princes, whose particular war aims could only with the greatest difficulty be made to coincide with the interests of Christendom as a whole. The appearance in the later fourteenth century of a balance-of-power dynamic in the relations between Italian states created a kind of paralysis with respect to any sort of common action. Even Pius II, the greatest crusading pope of the Renaissance, admitted in a passionate and bitter letter after the Council of Mantua that the princes of Europe could not be brought to place the good of Christendom above that of their several principalities; he concluded darkly that Western Christians might end up like those of the East, living in servitude under Islamic rule.

The fifteenth-century crusades also differed from those of the classical period in having as their primary object, not the recovery of the Holy Land, but the recovery of Constantinople. There were several reasons for this shift in aim. The Holy Land in the fifteenth century was in the hands of the Mamluk sultans of Egypt, who presented no particular military threat to the Latin West and with whom the commercial powers of Italy had worked out a mutually beneficial *moyen de vivre* with regard to trade. The Ottoman Turks of Asia Minor, by contrast, were a dynamic military power with expansionist designs in Europe itself, and the Italian commercial powers feared (though groundlessly, as it proved) that they would threaten European trading interests in the Levant.⁵ The fall of Constantinople and the attendant tales of Turkish atrocities thus served as a powerful symbol of the necessity for Europeans to unite in order to counter Turkish designs of conquest. The reconquest of Constantinople would be a strategic coup for the West as well: it would cut the Ottoman lands in two and inhibit the development of Turkish naval power in the northeastern Mediterranean.

Constantinople was also of course a holy city, one of the five patriarchal cities of ancient Christianity, and the capital of the Greek empire. Since the 1320s the Greeks had

⁵Housley, *Later Crusades*, 46 f, makes the point that the Holy Land never entirely disappeared from view as the object of crusading fervor. This is true even in the case of humanist crusading rhetoric: see, for example, Filelfo's epistle to Charles VII of 1451 (cited below, note 23), fol. 59v; Flavio Biondo's *De expeditione in Turchos* (cited below, note 11), 46; the end of Leonardo Dati's *Carmen ad Nicolaum V* (Text 2, below); and the end of Text 7. For the impact of the Ottomans on European trade in the Levant, see E. Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade* (Venice, 1983).

sought aid from Western Christians against the Ottomans, but the Latins, under the leadership of the pope, had always made submission to Rome the condition of Western aid. This had the effect of dividing the Byzantines among themselves and gave the West a convenient excuse for inaction. When at last the Greeks submitted, at the Council of Ferrara-Florence in 1438/39, the West did indeed organize a crusade, but it ended in the disastrous defeat at Varna in 1444. Then, when the pope forced the Greeks to proclaim the Union of the Churches in Constantinople itself in December of 1452, the fall of the city to the Turks and the end of the Greek empire followed by less than six months. It could thus be maintained (and in fact was maintained by the patriarch Gennadius, among others) that the intervention of the pope in Greek affairs had brought nothing but disaster from beginning to end; that the Turkish conquest was God's punishment for embracing Latin heresies. On the side of the popes there was pained surprise after 1453 that God had not rewarded the Greeks for their submission, and a renewed urgency to recover Constantinople for Christendom, if for no other reason than to show whose side God was really on. In the High Middle Ages the Greeks had been regarded by the Latins with suspicion and hatred for their supposed arrogance and double-dealing; in the Renaissance, especially after 1453, many Latins had a bad conscience about their Greek brethren, fellow Christians who had put their trust in Western aid and had been deceived. No longer were they schismatics and geopolitical rivals; now they were a prostrate nation, one more sect of oriental Christendom fallen under the yoke of an Islamic power.

Crusading had also changed markedly in spirit since the classical period. In the thirteenth century the trend toward professionalization had already set in, and by the fifteenth century it was virtually complete. The papacy and its princely allies took the view that popular crusading was undesirable as being ineffective and politically disruptive. The actual fighting should be placed in the hands of professionals; the role of civilians should be to contribute funds for the maintenance of armies. Despite the success of such "popular" military efforts as the defense of Belgrade in 1456, the role of non-professionals in fifteenth-century crusading was almost entirely financial, whether owing to successful papal policy or to lack of civilian enthusiasm for edged weapons it is difficult to tell.

Whatever the cause, there is no doubt that the fifteenth century was a period of moral bankruptcy for the crusading ideal. While we occasionally hear of large sums collected by crusade preachers, increasingly voices of cynicism and disillusionment emerge from the councils of Italian states. Too many times the princes of Europe had broken their promises; too often monies collected for crusading projects had been diverted into the coffers of princes and popes to serve unholy purposes. As the catalog of funds diverted illicitly from crusade became longer and longer, it became increasingly difficult to channel religious zeal into the purchase of crusading indulgences. The price of indulgences dropped; preachers began racheting up the pains of Purgatory till it became indistinguishable from Hell itself.⁶ Nothing worked. The preaching of crusade came to be regarded by a growing body of the laity as an elaborate shell game, a trick to bubble the

⁶See Black, *Accolti*, 241–85, for analysis of Florentine attitudes and N. Iorga, *Notices et extraits pour servir à l'histoire des croisades au XVe siècle*, 6 ser. (Paris-Bucharest, 1899–1916), esp. "Documents politiques" in series

credulous out of their cash. Pius II captures perfectly the sense of impotent rage that possessed those charged with the launching of crusades:

Over and over again we have pondered as to whether we could muster the strength of Christians against the Turks in one way or another and take measures to prevent the Christian peoples finally falling prey to them. We have spent many sleepless nights in meditation, tossing from side to side and deploring the unhappy calamities of our time. Our heart swelled and our old blood boiled with rage. We longed to declare war against the Turks and to put forth every effort in defense of religion, but when we measure our strength against that of the enemy, it is clear that the Church of Rome cannot defeat the Turks with its own resources. . . . If we send envoys to ask aid of sovereigns, they are laughed at. If we impose tithes on the clergy, they appeal for a future council. If we issue indulgences and encourage the contribution of money by spiritual gifts, we are accused of avarice. People think our sole object is to amass gold. No one believes what we say. Like insolvent tradesmen, we are without credit. Everything we do is interpreted in the worst way and since all princes are very avaricious and all prelates of the Church are slaves to money, they measure our disposition by their own.⁷

In such a situation—when rivalries between nation-states had eclipsed the older struggle of Christianity and Islam, when the crusading projects of popes and princes had lost all credibility, when the Latin West was on the defensive and its delusive hopes of easy victory were dashed over and over by events, when popular crusading zeal was shackled by the insecurity of rulers and enfeebled by widespread cynicism—the traditional modes of tapping the religious militancy of Christendom were no longer sufficient. The new conditions required an effective diplomacy that could demonstrate the seriousness of the Turkish threat in pragmatic terms and the need for European unity against the foe. They also called for the anti-Turkish war to be placed in a new ideological context, a context enabling political leaders to exploit hitherto-untapped sources of fear, hatred, and military enthusiasm. That is where the humanists came in.

Traditional crusading propaganda was very much a clerical and, especially, a papal industry.⁸ Crusades were proclaimed by the pope in encyclical letters, and crusading indulgences fixed. Encyclical letters were sent round to be read from the pulpits of Europe. The popes also organized regional councils, sent legates and entered into correspondence with secular lords who might be willing to go on crusade. Certain religious orders—first the Cistercians, later the Dominicans, Franciscans, and Augustinians—specialized in preaching crusades and raising money from the faithful for projected *passagia*. This activity grew so professionalized that by the thirteenth century the mendicant

2–3 on Venetian attitudes; on financial problems of indulgence abuse, see F. Remy, *Les Grandes Indulgences pontificales aux Pays-Bas à la fin du moyen-âge (1300–1531)* (Louvain, 1928).

⁷Pius II, *Commentarii rerum memorabilium que temporibus suis contigerunt*, ed. A. Van Heck, 2 vols., ST 312 and 313 (Vatican City, 1984), I, 460–61. The translation is from *Memoirs of a Renaissance Pope: The Commentaries of Pius II*, tr. F. A. Gragg (New York, 1962), 237.

⁸For medieval crusading literature, see U. Schwerin, *Die Aufrufe der Päpste zur Befreiung des Heiligenlandes* (Berlin, 1937); U. Müller, *Kreuzzugsdichtung* (Tübingen, 1969); N. Daniel, "Crusade Propaganda," in Setton, ed., *A History* (as in above, note 4), VI, 39–98; C. Morris, "Propaganda for War: The Dissemination of the Crusading Ideal in the Twelfth Century," in *The Church and War*, ed. W. J. Scheils, *Studies in Church History* 20 (Oxford, 1985); P. Cole, *The Preaching of the Crusades to the Holy Land, 1095–1270* (Cambridge, Mass., 1991).

orders had produced special handbooks on how to preach crusading sermons. In addition to this well-organized clerical propaganda, there was also a body of literature where popular and lay attitudes to crusading found expression: popular songs, *chansons de geste*, memoirs, the *gesta* literature. Toward the end of the thirteenth century, and especially after the fall of Acre in 1291, some laymen gave practical advice about crusading projects in the form of so-called *recuperatio* treatises—treatises designed to advise secular rulers and their counselors on the feasibility of crusade, military strategy, and logistics.

Humanist crusading literature, by contrast, was less dominated by clerical writers. It was also less dominated by what might be called the clerical point of view. Humanists wrote almost exclusively in classicizing Latin and preferred to cultivate ancient Roman literary genres. A number of humanists, it is true, continued to write crusading sermons, but these sermons, as John O'Malley has shown, were themselves transformed in form, subject matter, and diction under the influence of the classical epideictic oration.⁹ More often, the humanists composed explicit imitations of classical deliberative oratory, employing many of the ancient commonplaces known from rhetorical handbooks and from surviving examples, such as Demosthenes' *Philippics*. Sometimes these orations were actually delivered, like Pius II's orations at the Council of Mantua; other orations, such as Bessarion's *Orationes ad principes Christianos contra Turcos*, were pure literary compositions, intended to circulate in manuscript and printed form only.¹⁰ Humanists also wrote epistles, which might be formal public missives—diplomatic correspondence written on behalf of official bodies—or familiar letters, less formal compositions directed to friends, but intended for a wider circulation. The latter were usually modeled on Cicero's *Familiares* or Pliny. Sallust and Livy were popular models for humanist histories of recent wars with the Turks, as well as for Benedetto Accolti's history of the First Crusade. We have several examples of humanist treatises which come close to the *recuperatio* treatises of the fourteenth century in aim and content: Lampugnino Birago's *Strategicon adversus Turcos*, and Biondo's historical treatises to the Venetians and to Alfonso of Aragon.¹¹ Some humanist translations from classical Greek authors were undertaken with the purpose of encouraging crusade, such as Bessarion's translation of Demosthenes' *Olynthiac Orations*, which tried to draw a parallel between the modern Turkish threat and the threat to Greece in the time of Philip of Macedon.¹² Another example is Leonardo Bruni's para-

⁹J. W. O'Malley, *Praise and Blame in Renaissance Rome: Rhetoric, Doctrine and Reform in the Sacred Orators of the Papal Court, c. 1450–1521*, Duke Monographs in Medieval and Renaissance Studies 3 (Durham, N.C., 1979), esp. 232–35 on the Turkish threat. For an example, see Text 6, below.

¹⁰See the study of M. Meserve, cited below (note 15), and Texts 5 and 8 for examples of both kinds of oration.

¹¹A partial edition of the Birago text was published by A. Pertusi, "Le notizie sulla organizzazione amministrativa e militare dei Turchi nello 'Strategicon adversum Turcos' di Lampo Birago (c. 1453–55)," in *Studi sul Medioevo Cristiano offerti a Raffaello Morghen*, II, Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo, Studi storici, fasc. 88–82 (Rome, 1974), 670–700. Biondo's treatise *Ad Alphonsum Aragonensem de expeditione in Turchos* is published in *Scritti inediti e rari di Biondo Flavio*, ed. B. Nogara, ST 48 (Vatican City, 1927), 31–58; his *De gestis Venetorum* was published by Boninus de Boninis in Verona, 1481 (= Hain-Copinger 3243*; Goff B-702; IGI 1760).

¹²Bessarion's translations are actually entitled *Persuasio seu exhortatio III ex auctoritate Demosthenis*; the text is perhaps most readily available in A. Geueræus, G. Godelevæus, and N. Honigerus Koningshof, *Aulae Turcicae Othomannicæ imperii descriptio* (Basel, 1577), 372–90. In the argument, Bessarion makes the parallel as explicit as possible: "Ita enim tum Graeciae Philippus imminabat, ut nunc Turcus Italiae. Sustineat igitur Philippus Turci personam, Itali Atheniensium, nos Demosthenis: iam facile intelligis totam orationem causae nostrae convenire." Bessarion also supplied his translation with (printed) marginal notes designed to empha-

phrase of Procopius (dedicated to Giuliano Cesarini in 1441 during the preparations for the Crusade of Varna), whose aim was partly to remind the Latin West how the emperor in Constantinople had sent military aid to Italy when it, too, had been threatened by barbarians in the sixth century.¹³ Finally there is an enormous body of classicizing verse ranging from full-scale epics in dactylic hexameter to distichs and epigrams urging action against the Turk. In all, from the lifetime of Mehmed II, we have well over four hundred surviving literary compositions, short and long, written by at least fifty different humanists. The total volume is at least equal to all the surviving crusading literature of the High Middle Ages put together.¹⁴

The audience addressed by the humanists, on the other hand, was considerably narrower than that addressed by medieval crusading propagandists. The humanist message was directed in the first instance at courts, secular and ecclesiastical, and at the small governing classes of Renaissance oligarchies, these being most often the groups that had been humanistically educated and were therefore most responsive to classicizing Latin literature. We can get some sense of the audience for humanist crusading literature from Bessarion's *Orationes ad principes Christianos Contra Turcos*, already mentioned, a collection of writings about whose circulation we know a surprising amount.¹⁵ The collection was printed at Bessarion's request in Paris by the French humanist Guillaume Fichet in April of 1471 at the printshop Fichet sponsored in the basement of the Sorbonne. That the *Orationes* were printed suggests that they were intended to appeal to a broad public; in fact, nearly the opposite seems to have been the case. The orations were neither official church propaganda nor transcripts of speeches given on public occasions. Bessarion could therefore afford to neglect the traditional religious and idealistic themes he usually invoked on such occasions and to address directly the leaders of Christendom using the most hard-headed, realistic arguments he could summon. The print run of the first edition seems to have amounted at most to a hundred or so copies; about half of these copies were already earmarked for presentation to particular "princes," that is, leaders, of Christendom. Fichet sent at least forty-nine copies to lay and ecclesiastical potentates across Europe, many with elegant hand-painted illuminations and other "personalized" additions, such as interleaved manuscript letters of presentation. It is true that there were twelve subsequent editions of the text (three in Italian translation), yet all but one of these were printed in the sixteenth century; the one other incunabular edition (an Italian version published by Valdarfer at Venice in 1471) was probably produced less in expectation of appealing to a wide audience than as a gesture of thanks by the translator,

size the lessons of history. For example: "Audite, Christiani principes, Demosthenem physicum et oratorem, iam tot secula mortuum, de statu hostis vestri nunc disserentem eloquentissime, et sapientissime monstrantem quid vos facere oporteat, ne in graviora dilabamini."

¹³For Bruni's *De bello italico adversus Gothos*, see my forthcoming *Repertorium Brunianum: A Guide to the Writings of Leonardo Bruni*, vol. II, Istituto storico per il Medio Evo, Nuovi studi storici (Rome).

¹⁴See above, note 3. For examples of crusading verse, see Texts 2 and 5.

¹⁵M. Meserve, "Cardinal Bessarion's Orations against the Turks and Their Printing History" (M.A. thesis, Warburg Institute, University of London, 1993). I am grateful to Miss Meserve for allowing me to consult her work, from which the information in the rest of the paragraph above is taken. For Bessarion's remarkably prescient realization of the power of the press, see M. D. Feld, "Sweynheym and Pannartz, Cardinal Bessarion, Neoplatonism: Renaissance Humanism and Two Printers' Choice of Texts," *Harvard Library Bulletin* (1982), 282–335, and J. Hankins, *Plato in the Italian Renaissance*, 2 vols., Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 17 (Leiden, 1992), I, 214 f.

Ludovico Carbone, to his patrons Bessarion and Borso d'Este. So despite the claim of Robert Schwoebel and other scholars that this imprint constitutes the first piece of printed political propaganda, Bessarion and Fichet were not aiming at the kind of mass communication associated with propaganda campaigns today, but rather addressing a relatively small group of elite readers.

All this is not to assert, of course, that traditional crusade preaching did not continue during the quattrocento. The printing of crusade indulgences alone shows that this mendicant industry continued to thrive. We know of a number of celebrated friars who went on preaching crusade in the traditional manner, men such as fra Giovanni da Napoli, fra Michele Carcano, St. Bernardino of Siena, and fra Roberto Carraciolo da Lecce. But these men aimed at the broadest possible audience, and their chief objective was to raise money. The humanists addressed only elites, religious and lay, and their purpose was primarily to press European governments to take military action against the Turk.¹⁶

This being the case, it was inevitable that the humanists should have introduced a number of new themes and emphases into their writings on crusade. Traditional crusading propaganda stressed the religious motivations for crusade. In Urban II's famous sermons advocating crusade, he had mentioned such themes as the need to aid Eastern Christians who were suffering and appealing for help; the desecration of holy places in Jerusalem by the (Seljuk) Turks; the obligation of Christian fighting men to avenge insults to God; the spiritual rewards of crusade; and Frankish traditions of military bravery in the service of the Church, going back to the time of Charlemagne. By the thirteenth century preachers had developed a more or less standard repertory of commonplaces that could be drawn upon at need by preachers or other writers. For instance, in the *De praedicatione crucis* (1265/66) of Humbert of Romans, a manual written to instruct preachers how to preach crusade, an elaborate set of topics and subtopics was developed around the main themes of crusading sermons. One such theme was the question of why a crusade could be considered a just war. Christian religious warfare was justified, in Humbert's analysis, (1) because a guilty people (the Saracens) had attacked innocent people (Eastern Christians and pilgrims); (2) because the war was undertaken for good purposes—enforcing the justice of God and defending faith—not for glory or gain; (3) because the war was sanctioned by human and divine authority. An individual warrior was acting justly if he fought for the correct motives, that is, zeal for the divine name and for the Christian religion, love of his brethren, devotion to the Holy Land, desire for spiritual rewards and the graces of the Church, and admiration for the pious example of his forefathers.¹⁷ Preachers emphasized that the crusade was a pilgrimage, a voluntary act of penance done in obedience to a public vow, and so should be accompanied by confes-

¹⁶On Giovanni da Napoli and Michele Carcano, see Black, *Accolti*, 245, 273; on Bernardino of Siena, see K. Hefele, *Der hl. Bernardin von Siena und die franziskanische Wanderpredigt in Italien während des XV. Jhdts.* (Freiburg im Br., 1912); on Roberto Carraciolo, see Pertusi, *Testi inediti*, 293–96. That humanist literature was aimed at an elite rather than popular audience is also suggested by the way Bessarion and Cusanus varied their message in accordance with their audience; see below, notes 19 and 49. Pius II organized a regular program of crusade preaching, partially documented in Vatican City, Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Reg. Vat. 519 (“Bulle sancte Crociate sub Pio II et Paulo II”): Baptista de Saxoferrato OFM is appointed crusade preacher in Lucca (fol. 47r), Angelus de Bulseno OFM in Lazio and southern Tuscany (fol. 45r), and Bartolomeus de Colle OFM in the March of Ancona (fol. 46v).

¹⁷See Cole, *Preaching of Crusades*, 202–17.

sion, true contrition for sins, restitution of stolen goods, reconciliation with enemies, and pious exercises. Crusade was not only a spiritual benefit to crusaders, it also benefited the Church. Holy War against the Saracens revealed to the Church her true friends and true enemies, and increased the unity and social harmony of Christendom by redirecting destructive violent energies against a common foe.

War is impossible without hatred of the enemy, and it was thus the aim of crusading propagandists to demonize the Islamic enemy. Traditional crusading literature drew upon a rich treasury of negative stereotypes regarding Islam, many of them going back to the ninth century or even earlier.¹⁸ Muhammad was a dirty Arab trader whose depraved religious law was no more than a rationalization of his own vices. Islam was a religion of cruelty, deception, violence, and sexual perversion. It was a weapon fashioned by the Devil to supplant and destroy Christianity; it was a scourge which God permitted to flay the backs of sinful Christians. Islam was irrational since it refused to allow Christians to dispute publicly with Muslims. Islamic *jihad* had as its only motive the destruction of Christendom. Crusading literature was full of lurid tales of how Muslims had mocked and defiled Christian holy images, outraged Christian nuns, engaged in pederasty with Christian boys, turned churches into brothels and stables, dragged crucifixes through muddy streets, and so forth.

To read the humanist crusading literature of the last half of the fifteenth century is to enter a different world. One difference was tone and style. The nearly universal desire among humanists to achieve a Ciceronian fullness, urbanity, and elegance of diction tended to undercut their rhetorical aim, which required, rather, a passionate and sincere form of address. Much more important, however, were the thematic differences separating traditional from humanistic crusading literature. To be sure, there was some degree of topical continuity with the older literature. The fall of Constantinople, for example, brought forth descriptions of the sack of the city and Turkish atrocities that hardly differed from twelfth-century accounts of Muslim atrocities in Jerusalem. Like the medieval preachers before them, many humanist orators argued that Latin Christians had an obligation to help the Greeks and described the desecration of Santa Sophia and other holy places of Constantinople. As in the Middle Ages, crusade was sometimes promoted as a way to bring an end to the endemic warfare among western European powers. Yet the discontinuities remain more striking than the continuities. Few humanists bothered to argue the justice of crusade, perhaps because there was little need to invoke the old Augustinian arguments for a "just war" in the face of Turkish aggression, or perhaps because few members of the elites they addressed were in danger of breaking ranks and associating themselves with the heretics and vulgar skeptics who tended to make radical criticisms of crusading as such. While medieval preachers warned potential crusaders against the spiritual dangers of vainglory, humanist orators openly boasted of the immortal fame that victories would win for the crusading hero. Indeed, the humanists in general did not speak of the spiritual benefits of crusade. They emphasized the practical political benefits of crusading, such as Poggio, who threatened the emperor with a loss of prestige if he did not participate. Since the humanists were not directly involved in flogging indulgences, their failure to mention the religious value of crusade is, perhaps,

¹⁸See N. Daniel, *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image* (Edinburgh, 1958).

not surprising. Nor is it surprising that they neglected the theme of pilgrimage, because the object of crusade for them was Constantinople, not the Holy Land. But the relative neglect of religious motives in their writings—other than the most general one of protecting Christendom—is striking nonetheless.¹⁹

The topics upon which humanist proponents of crusade tended to spread themselves were the topics of “necessity” and “ease”—the necessity for undertaking war against the Turk, and the ease with which victories could be won. There was a danger that the two topics would work against each other. To show that the crusade was necessary meant showing that the Turk was a formidable and aggressive opponent; to show that victory would be easy meant showing that the Turk could be readily beaten. Humanist orators mostly handled the rhetorical challenge by some version of the *divide et impera* topos. The Turk was winning only because he was taking on European Christians piecemeal. His forces were not more numerous or more powerful than those of the Latin West, but it would take united action from Western armies to oppose him successfully. Bessarion was fond of pointing out the obvious parallel from Greek history: when the Greeks had united against Xerxes, they had won; they had lost when they allowed Philip of Macedon to divide and conquer.²⁰ Following Demetrius Cydones in the fourteenth century, several humanists, such as Isidore of Kiev and George Trebizond (in his anti-Turk phase), invoked a kind of “domino theory.” If we do not unite to defend Constantinople, wrote George in 1452 to Nicholas V, the Latin trading colonies will fall one by one:

To say nothing of all of Europe, [the Greeks] guard many [Latin] Catholic cities, so that if they themselves perish, Pera, Caffa, Negroponte, Crete, and many other cities and regions held and dwelt in by Catholics will be cast into slavery under the enemies of the Cross.²¹

George was here trying to overcome Latin prejudice against helping Orthodox “heretics” by appealing to self-interest. Bessarion, by contrast, had to develop a rhetorical strategy to deal with another problem. Some powers, he knew, secretly believed that it would be easier to fight the Turk once he had been weakened by war with one of their own Western rivals. A policy of “watch and wait” would thus have the merit of weakening two enemies at a stroke. Against this policy, Bessarion brilliantly argued that the structure of Turkish society was nomadic and warlike; Mehmed had only utilized a small part of his nation’s power, but each successive victory increased his authority and his ability to bring more troops into the line. Each victory, therefore, only made him stronger; if the West wanted to resist him, they would all have to fight together, and the sooner the better.²²

¹⁹For Poggio’s letter to Frederick, see his *Epistolae*, ed. T. Tonelli, III (Florence, 1861), 203–11 = idem, *Lettere*, ed. H. Harth, III (Florence, 1987), 381–87. That Bessarion was nevertheless familiar with all the traditional religious arguments for crusade is shown by his instructions for the official Venetian crusade preachers in 1463; see L. Mohler, “Bessarions Instruktion für die Kreuzzugspredigt in Venedig,” *RQ* 35 (1927), 337–50.

²⁰See Bessarion’s *Orationes ad principes Christianos adversus Turcos* in *Aulae Turcae descriptio*, Pars II, 315–72.

²¹*Collectanea Trapezuntiana: Texts, Documents and Bibliographies of George of Trebizond*, ed. J. Monfasani, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 25 (Binghamton, N.Y., 1984), 437. For Cydones, see I. Ševčenko, “The Decline of Byzantium as Seen through the Eyes of Its Intellectuals,” *DOP* 15 (1961), 169–86, reprinted in his *Society and Intellectual Life in Late Byzantium* (London, 1981), art. II.

²²Bessarion, in *Aulae Turcae descriptio*, Pars II, 327 f. A detailed analysis of Bessarion’s arguments may be found in Meserve, “Bessarion’s Orations,” 4–16.

Some humanists, however, regarded as impractical the policy of uniting all of Christendom in peace antecedently to declaring a crusade. An alternative, more realistic project was to induce one of the kings of Christendom—Alfonso of Aragon, the king of France or the duke of Burgundy—to unite with the Venetians and form a simple bilateral force against the Turk. It was hoped, of course, that initial successes would cause other powers to join the crusade out of shame or out of fear of a rival growing too strong. The bilateral policy demanded a rhetorical strategy different from that used by the multilateralists. The multilateralists liked to calculate the Great Turk's power as too large for any one power to face alone, but smaller than the united forces of Western Christendom. The bilateralists—men such as Francesco Filelfo in a letter to the king of France or Lampugnino Birago in his feasibility study for Nicholas V—tended to come up with much lower estimates of Turkish power. Some also predicted that the many thousands of Balkan Christians living under Turkish rule would rise up against the Turk at the first approach of a Christian army.²³

Crusading propagandists of the medieval period had made use primarily of religious symbolism and stereotypes to arouse hatred of the enemy. The use of religious stereotypes in humanist war propaganda continued, but was to a large extent supplemented or replaced by stereotypes associated with the ancient distinction between the civilized and the barbarian. The Greeks and Romans had often justified the extension of their borders on the grounds that they were spreading civilization and taming or restraining the barbaric hordes beyond them. This justification of crusade was sometimes employed in medieval juridical literature on crusading,²⁴ but it was vastly extended by the humanists, among whom it became a standard rhetorical topos. So while the humanists, like the medieval preachers, continued to mine the rich vein of anti-Muslim prejudice, demonizing their Muslim opponents as cruel, perverted, deceitful, filthy, and tools of the Devil, they were also able to add new categories of abuse. The Turks, as a nomadic people, were *eo ipso* barbarians, therefore warlike, violent, unstable, and untrustworthy. Pius II, in a classic piece of out-group stereotyping, described them as “ignorant of wine, grain and salt,” eating abominable meats such as the flesh of wolves, vultures and human fetuses.²⁵

One aspect of the supposed barbarism of the Turks was their hostility to good letters. This was a highly effective theme in an age and among a class of men who valued Greco-Roman literature as the purest source of the arts and of civilized values. It also fit well with the theme of the fall of Constantinople and the end of Greek civilization. Pius II's lament for the fall of Constantinople is well known:

²³ Filelfo's letter to Charles VII of France is in his *Epistolarum familiarium libri XXXVII ex eius exemplari transumpti* (Venice, 1502), fols. 55r–59r, dated 17 February 1451, esp. fol. 58r: “Et ut summam accipias, rex Karole, quae qualesque sunt Turcorum vires, vix ad sexaginta hominum milia exercitus omnis ascendit peditibus equitibusque conflatus”; Filelfo also argued that Demetrius Paleologus would come to the crusaders' aid. The letter ends with a fantasy of future French conquests in the Holy Land and Asia. For Birago, see the edition of Pertusi, “Le notizie,” 694; he put Turkish strength at about 65,000 men. For other estimates of Turkish strength, see Pertusi, *La caduta*, I, lxxiii; the estimates of the “multilateralists” range from 160,000 (Francesco Barbaro) to 400,000 (Chalcocondyles, Dukas, and Paolo Dotti).

²⁴ See M. Villey, *La croisade: essai sur la formation d'une théorie juridique* (Paris, 1942), 26 f. Demetrius Cydones had already identified the Turks with the barbarians in 1391: see Pertusi, *La caduta*, I, xi.

²⁵ The pope in this passage follows closely his source, the fourth-century Latin cosmographer Aethicus, who had recently been rediscovered; see M. J. Heath, *Crusading Commonplaces: La Noue, Lucinge and Rhetoric* (Geneva, 1986), 26.

O famous Greece, behold now thy end! Who does not grieve for you? There remained up to this day in Constantinople a remembrance of your ancient wisdom, and no Latin was considered adequately learned unless he spent time studying in Constantinople, as though it were the home of letters. The name Athens had for learning when Rome was in flower long ago, Constantinople had in our own day. It was from thence we received Plato, from thence that the works of Aristotle, Demosthenes, Xenophon, Thucydides, Basil, Dionysius, Origen and many others were made manifest to the Latin peoples in our time, and we had hoped to receive many more in the future. But now that the Turks have won and possess all that Greek power once held, I believe Greek letters are finished. [. . .] It will all now be very different under the rule of the Turks, the most savage of men, the enemies of good customs and good letters.²⁶

But the theme is a common one in humanist orations on the Turkish threat. Lauro Quirini, a Venetian member of the circle of Bessarion, wrote

Thus in our miserable time an ancient, noble and rich city, once the capital of the Roman Empire, mistress of all the Orient, has been captured by most savage barbarians, sacked for three days, and has come into wretched servitude, the worst of all evils. [. . .] Constantinople, an imperial city, once the citadel of the Roman Empire, conqueror and mistress of provinces—alas!—has now been cruelly and wretchedly seized. [. . .] Add to this the fact that all these wicked deeds were done by most savage barbarians, for not only has a royal city been captured, temples devastated and holy places polluted, but an entire race has been overcome—the name of Greece is blotted out. Over a hundred and twenty thousand volumes were destroyed, as I learn from Cardinal Isidore of Kiev. Thus both the language and literature of the Greeks discovered, increased and perfected with so much time, labor and effort, has perished, alas! [. . .] That literature has perished which illuminated all the globe, which gave us the laws of salvation, holy philosophy and the other good arts by which human life is embellished. [. . .] A rude and barbarous race, living according to no fixed laws or customs, but unfettered, nomadic, willful—this race, filled with treachery and fraud, shamefully and ignominiously tramples underfoot a Christian people.²⁷

The theme was doubly poignant, of course, for the Western hellenists of the quattrocento. Many if not most contemporary humanists who knew Greek had learned it either of emigres from Constantinople or had studied in the Greek capital themselves. The “lament for Greece” topos thus enabled the humanists to paint the Turks as the cultural opposite of Renaissance Europe. If the humanists had revived Greek and Latin learning, the Turks were bent on destroying it. As Francesco Tateo has noted, the very word that the humanists use over and over again to describe the Turk—*immanis*—is the lexical opposite of *humanitas*, the word that expresses the Renaissance ideal of culture.²⁸ In humanist histories and orations, *immane genus* replaced *infideles* as the preferred epithet for the Turks.

The humanist adulation of the classical world also meant that they began to look to

²⁶ Pertusi, *La caduta*, II, 52–54.

²⁷ Pertusi, *Testi inediti*, 72–76.

²⁸ F. Tateo, “L’ideologia umanistica e il simbolo ‘immane’ di Otranto,” in *Otranto 1480: Atti del convegno internazionale di studi promosso in occasione del V centenario della caduta di Otranto ad opera dei Turchi*, ed. C. Damiano Fonseca (Galatina, 1986), I, 151–256, reprinted with additions and revisions as “Letterati e guerrieri di fronte al pericolo turco,” in *Chierici e feudatori del Mezzogiorno* (Bari, 1984), 21–67; for the contemporary meaning of *humanitas* and *immanitas*, see Pontano’s *De immanitate* in his *Opera omnia soluta oratione composita* (Venice, 1518), 311–26.

the classical world for their model crusaders. No doubt this is partly because the humanists were addressing Renaissance Italians, not medieval French nobles; medieval preachers had naturally tried to make their listeners identify with the great French military traditions of the past in order to whip up crusading ardor. But this again is a case of medieval themes being supplemented, rather than replaced, by classicizing themes. The humanists continued to admire and cite the example of the great medieval crusaders such as Bohemond and Geoffrey of Bouillon—indeed, the Florentine humanist and jurist Benedetto Accolti wrote a classicizing history of the First Crusade that celebrated the feats of the great medieval heroes.²⁹ But humanists also urged their readers and hearers to model themselves on famous classical generals such as Pausanias or Scipio Africanus, who had defeated Xerxes and Hannibal; and they promised to glorify their own deeds in immortal works of literature. Biondo Flavio's famous history, *Roma Triumphans*, dedicated to Pius II, was written with the express purpose of making known to modern Europeans the glorious victories of their Roman ancestors over barbarians, thus inspiring them to similar deeds against the Turk.³⁰

Can it be said, then (to sum up) that the humanists “secularized” crusading literature? The answer to this question is less than clear-cut. Though it is undeniable that the humanists contributed greatly to the secularization of European war propaganda, they neither began the process nor ended it. For the beginnings of a “secular” view of crusading, as Norman Daniel has argued, one must go back to the *recuperatio* treatises of the early fourteenth century, with their intensely pragmatic, proto-colonialist approach to crusading.³¹ Pierre Dubois' *De recuperatione terre sancte*, for example, clearly saw crusading in the first instance as a French affair intended to create an eastern empire for the French king. On the other hand, one can come down to the present day and still find religious elements in the war propaganda of Western powers.

The more important contribution of humanist crusade writings is not the partial secularization of a certain class of literature, but rather the articulation of a new secular identity for western Europe. In the High Middle Ages Europeans saw their military adventures in Greece, Asia Minor, and the Holy Land as justified primarily on religious grounds. The infidels were to be cast out of formerly Christian lands because they were God's enemies; the heretical Greeks were to be humbled because they refused to submit to Rome. Since the Holy Roman emperor played only an intermittent role in crusading projects, and since his political ambitions were generally antithetical to those of the pope, it was rare to find any integration of the Roman imperial ideal with the crusading ideal. With the Renaissance, however, western Europe began to identify itself with civilization and its foreign enemies with barbarism. Though at later points in Europe's imperial

²⁹See Black, *Accolti*, chaps. 9–10. Filelfo made similar references to medieval French crusading heroes in his letter to Charles VII (cited above, note 23), as did Biondo Flavio in his *Oratio coram serenissimo imperatore Frederico et Alphonso Aragonum rege inclito, Neapoli in publico conventu habita*, in Nogara, *Scritti inediti*, 107–14. For Guillaume Fichet's invocation of crusading ancestors in his letters advocating Holy War to various potentates of northern Europe, see Meserve, “Bessarion's Orations,” 25–28.

³⁰B. Flavio, *Romae Triumphantis libri X* (Brescia, 1482), [fol. 2r].

³¹Daniel, “Crusading Propaganda,” 88. For the *recuperatio* literature, see S. Schein, *Fideles Crucis: The Papacy, the West, and the Recovery of the Holy Land, 1274–1314* (Oxford, 1991); for the *recuperatio* treatise of William Durant the Younger, see C. Fasolt, *Council and Hierarchy: The Political Thought of William Durant the Younger* (Cambridge, 1991).

career this was modified so that Europeans spoke of themselves as belonging to a “higher” or “more advanced” civilization, from the Renaissance on the idea of civilization came more and more—especially after the Reformation—to supplant the idea of Christendom as the basis of European identity. By the nineteenth century, Christianity had been reduced to a mere instrument or by-product of Europe’s civilizing mission. It is beyond the scope of this essay to inquire whether the secularization of the European identity was a conscious aim or an unintended consequence of the humanist movement. But it is not too much to say that the idea of western Europe as the true heir to Greek and Latin antiquity, and therefore as the heartland of civilization, begins to be articulated in the humanist crusading literature of the later fifteenth century.³²

II. HUMANISTS AND THE POLITICS OF CRUSADE

The foregoing remarks will inevitably have reinforced the widely held belief that the humanists of the quattrocento were united in favoring crusades against the Turks. This belief, however, is incorrect. It has arisen because the humanist writings most easily identifiable as relating to the Turks and the Crusades tend naturally to be exhortations to take the Cross. Other testimonia to humanists’ views on crusading are harder to find and assess. In the fifteenth century it was still considered shameful to speak publicly against crusade. European princes whose interests were not served by crusading and who had not the slightest intention of taking the Cross still put forth in public elaborate excuses in order to avoid the appearance of impiety and disloyalty to Christendom. Even in the closed councils of the Italian republics it was necessary for speakers to pay lip service, at least, to crusading ideals. For similar reasons it was impossible for the humanists to engage in open policy debate on the merits or otherwise of a crusade against the Turk. The arguments in favor of a policy of crusade could be stated, the arguments against it could not. Nonetheless, there are numerous hints and indirect evidence that many humanists, like other members of the public, had deep reservations about the feasibility and utility of crusading. Such dissenting views can sometimes be reconstructed from the counterarguments used by other humanists in answer to them. Sometimes, too, anti-crusading opinion is hidden in pseudonymous works, such as the famous letter supposedly directed to Pius II by the Great Turk. But it is difficult to judge the degree to which humanists privately disagreed with the crusading projects they might publicly, as professional rhetoricians, be called upon to advocate.³³

In practice, humanist views on crusade tended to reflect those of their employers and patrons: the princes, ecclesiastical lords, and oligarchs of Renaissance Italy. Of course no two states had identical policies and interests with respect to Ottoman expansionism; often there were sharp divisions even within the courts and governing circles of individ-

³²The view taken here differs from that of Schwoebel, *The Shadow*, chap. 6, where it is argued that humanism made no difference to the way western Europe viewed the Turk. I develop here the position of Tateo (note 28 above) and M. J. Heath, “Renaissance Scholars and the Origins of the Turks,” *Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et Renaissance* 41 (1979), 453–71.

³³For the variety of views available, see R. Schwoebel, “Coexistence, Conversion and the Crusade against the Turks,” *Studies in the Renaissance* 12 (1965), 164–87. For the pseudo-Mehmed letter, see below, note 97. A poetic parallel to the pseudo-Mehmed letter is edited as Text 12, below. Text 11 illustrates the contemporary anxiety to preserve the image of princes as dutiful crusaders.

ual states. The popes from Eugene IV to Sixtus IV all officially favored crusade and several were passionate advocates of it. King Alfonso of Aragon was also officially in favor of crusading, though his actual behavior suggests that he did not take the Turkish threat seriously, but was chiefly interested in protecting Aragonese mercantile and dynastic interests in Egypt and the Balkans. The anti-Turkish policies he favored publicly were in any case quite different from those of the pope. Alfonso promoted a policy of encirclement and expressed a willingness to ally himself with the Mamluks and other Muslim rivals of the Ottomans. The pope, on the other hand, could not be seen to be in league with Islamic powers, yet was eager to keep Alfonso occupied with foreign adventures; if Alfonso were engaged elsewhere, he could not continue his habitual incursions into the Papal State. For his part, the pope preferred a Balkan strategy: he hoped to chase the Ottomans from Rumeli by backing champions such as the Hunyadi and Scanderbeg. The emperor, too, preferred to attack through the Balkans, the flank where he himself was threatened, but at the same time feared that such a strategy would weaken his own position and strengthen those of his rivals to the East, the kings of Hungary and Poland.³⁴

The Florentines and the Milanese, closely allied during the period in question, were the Italian powers least enthusiastic about crusade.³⁵ The Milanese spent much of the century struggling against the expansion of Venetian power in northeastern Italy, and were therefore eager for the Serenissima to involve itself in costly wars with the Turk while avoiding such wars themselves. Theirs was a policy of masterly inactivity. The Florentines under Cosimo de' Medici were officially in favor of crusade, though real enthusiasm for it waxed and waned with changing political circumstances. But under Lorenzo, Florentine policy took a decided—though covert—pro-Turkish tilt. The Florentines were one of the powers that had done well out of the fall of Constantinople; the Turks had favored their designs to break into the Levantine trade hitherto controlled by the Venetians and Genoese. In the Italian war following the Pazzi conspiracy of 1478, Lorenzo was hard pressed by Alfonso of Aragon until the Turks landed at Otranto in 1480. Lorenzo was deeply grateful to Mehmed for his timely intervention and had a medal struck in his honor designed by his favorite medalist, Bertoldo di Giovanni.³⁶ It was also

³⁴F. Cerone, "La politica orientale di Alfonso di Aragona," *AStNap* 27 (1902), 3–93, and 28 (1903), 154–212; C. Marinesco, "Le pape Calixte III, Alfonse V d'Aragon, roi de Naples et l'offensive contre les Turcs," *BSHAcrRoum* 19 (1935), 77–97; J. Gill, "Pope Callixtus III and Scanderbeg the Albanian," *OCP* 33 (1967), 534–62; A. Ryder, "The Eastern Policy of Alfonso the Magnanimous," *Atti dell'Accademia Pontaniana*, n.s., 28 (1979), 7–25; and Pius II's *Commentarii*, passim.

³⁵L. Fumi, "Il disinteresse di Francesco I Sforza alla crociata di Callisto III contro i turchi," *AStLomb* 39 (1912), 101–13; F. Babinger, "Lorenzo de' Medici e la corte ottomana," *AStIt* 121 (1963), 307 f; R. Black, "La storia della prima crociata di Benedetto Accolti e la diplomazia fiorentina rispetto all'Oriente," *AStIt* 131 (1973), 3–25; and idem, *Accolti*, 241–70.

³⁶The medal reads MAVMHET ASIE AC TRAPESVNZII MAGNEQVE GREITIE IMPERAT<OR>. Babinger ("Lorenzo di' Medici") argues unconvincingly against the view of E. Jacobs (SBHeid [1919], 24n) that "Magna Graecia" signifies southern Italy; Babinger thinks it must be equivalent to "Rumeli." But Lorenzo surely knew the ancient significance of the term "Magna Graecia" (as did Bessarion and contemporary Neapolitan humanists; see below, note 101). And there is no reason, given Lorenzo's general attitude to the Turk and to Alfonso, why he would not be willing to recognize a Turkish claim to southern Italy in this fashion. In the dedicatory letter to Lorenzo of his *De luce et visibili paradoxon* (Florence: Francesco Bonaccorsi, 1482 = Hain 2778, IGI 1472, GW 3839), Bartolomeo Benvoglianti, a Siennese *fuoruscito* and Medici client, declared that the Turkish invasion of Otranto took place thanks to the intervention of the Blessed Virgin against Alfonso of Aragon; the text of the letter is reproduced in my article, "Lorenzo de' Medici as a Patron

probably a sign of his gratitude to Mehmed that he had one of his humanist protégés, Francesco Berlinghieri, send presentation copies of his *Geographia* to Mehmed and to his sons, Bayezid and the captive prince Djem.³⁷ There is some evidence as well that Lorenzo exchanged intelligence reports with the sultan in return for trading privileges; he may also have plotted to return Prince Djem to Sultan Bayezid II. But though Lorenzo cloaked in secrecy all his dealings with the Great Turk, he could not prevent rumors from circulating. It was widely believed that he had been responsible for inviting the Turk into Italy in 1480. Thanks to Lorenzo's fame as a philoturk, Florence further enhanced its existing reputation for greed and impiety.³⁸

The great Italian commercial entrepôts, Venice and Genoa, had a different problem. Both cities had large mercantile and territorial interests in the Levant. To guarantee the health of these interests they needed to maintain good relations with the greatest power in the eastern Mediterranean. The Genoese colonies in the Black Sea were already tributaries of the sultan, and had even rendered him naval assistance at the battle of Varna in 1444—to the disgust of other Europeans; Pera had remained officially neutral throughout the siege of Constantinople. The Venetians were the key to any successful combined land and sea operation in the eastern Mediterranean. The fact that the sultan was able to put tremendous economic pressure on the Venetians was probably the single most important reason for the failure of the West to launch a major crusade in the fifteenth century.³⁹ The Venetians had made peace with the sultan in 1430, 1446, and 1451 and were officially neutral during the siege of Constantinople. Yet the tension between their economic interests and their Christian loyalties led to some unusual contradictions. The Venetian Senate voted to pay the usual tribute to the sultan on 7 May 1453, the very day that it finally voted, after long dithering, to send a flotilla in relief of Constantinople; yet the admiral in charge was instructed not to molest Turkish persons or property in bringing aid to the besieged lest the peace be endangered.⁴⁰ They had forgotten their Livy: *Senatu deliberante Saguntum periit*. Both the Genoese and the Venetians also stood to gain from the breakup of the Byzantine Empire. It was only when Venice's own territories

of Philosophy," *Rinascimento*, n.s., 34 (1994), 34–35. For Florentine trade in the Ottoman Bursa during the second half of the fifteenth century, see H. Inalcik, "Bursa and the Commerce of the Levant," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 3 (1960), 131–47.

³⁷The manuscript was intended for Mehmed II, but as the latter died before it could be given him, the work was presented instead to his son Bayezid II. See F. Babinger, *Spätmittelalterliche frankische Briefschaften aus dem grossherrlichen Seraj zu Stamboul*, *Sudosteuropäische Arbeiten* 61 (Munich, 1963), 19 f.

³⁸See F. Babinger, *Mehmed the Conqueror and His Time* (Princeton, N.J., 1978), 182 f, 504; according to Tateo, "L'ideologia," later Neapolitan historiography routinely accuses the Florentines of inviting the Turk into Italy in 1480. An influential but (now) little-known example of this attitude can be found in Laudivius' *Epistolae Magni Turci*, a frequently reprinted collection of sample letters (of course pseudonymous) intended for Latin composition classes in grammar schools; in this text, the Florentines and the Turks are represented as on friendly terms, exchanging gifts and benefits, while the Turks and the rest of the European powers exchange threats and insults. On this collection, see F. Babinger, *Laudivius Zacchia: Erdichter der Epistolae Magni Turci*, SBMünch, heft 13 (1960). The extraordinary later history of this and other pseudo-Turk collections in eastern Europe is told in D. C. Waugh, *The Great Turkes Defiance: On the History of the Apocryphal Correspondence of the Ottoman Sultan in Its Muscovite and Russian Variants* (Columbus, Ohio, 1978).

³⁹See Housley, *Later Crusades*, 428–29. Hence the bitter remarks of persons at the papal court, such as Jean Germain, criticizing merchants who visited Islamic lands and returned as cultural relativists (Southern, *Western Views*, 90 f). Pius II confided to his *Commentarii* (I, 205, 223) his view that merchants are always against crusade for ignoble reasons of profit: "mercatores . . . quibus in lucro erat cum Turcis pacem habere."

⁴⁰Iorga, *Notices et extraits*, III, 283.

were directly attacked by Mehmed a decade later that the Venetians went to war with the Turks—while the other Italian powers looked on gleefully.⁴¹

The contrasting interests among the several Italian powers with respect to the Ottomans led, naturally, to a variety of policies; the range of possible stances reminds one, almost, of the Cold War. There were those who advocated an immediate armed response after each Turkish victory, some who advised containment, some negotiation, some appeasement, some peaceful coexistence; there were even, marvelous to relate, some who believed that issues between Christians and Muslims might be settled by rational discussion. The differing policies of the European powers can sometimes be found reflected in the writings of the Italian humanists, especially in their more private writings. Though many humanists were doubtless committed advocates of crusade, many others were lukewarm or pragmatic in their attitudes. Francesco Barbaro, who during Venice's war with the Ottomans in the 1470s became a hawk, was at an earlier period the very figure of a hand-wringing professional diplomat: in May of 1453 he wrote to friends at the papal court urging them to put the Turk on notice that the Roman church would take a serious view of his action in laying siege to Constantinople.⁴² Poggio Bracciolini, who wrote a number of semi-public letters strongly favoring crusade, could in other, less public writings, take a more frigid view of holy wars; certainly he regarded mendicant crusade preachers with contempt. A recently published missive of Leonardo Bruni, written on behalf of the Florentine Signoria, expresses the disgust of the Florentine *reggimento* at the tactics of crusade preachers and dismay at their attempt to drain specie from Florentine into Roman coffers without first obtaining the consent of the Florentine authorities.⁴³ Francesco Filelfo's public pronouncements on crusade also seem to mirror the twists and turns of his patron Francesco Sforza's policies.⁴⁴ But the rule is not invariable. One can also find a few instances where humanists differed from their patrons' Turkish policies, such as Marsilio Ficino and his follower Andrea Cambini, who openly took pro-crusading positions despite Lorenzo de' Medici's known Turcophilia.⁴⁵

Opposition to crusade at the level of practical policy was of course only one form of resistance to the call for Holy War against the Turk. Some humanist critiques of crusading can be linked with older traditions of dissent.⁴⁶ In the High Middle Ages there were, generally speaking, two broad categories of criticism, which we may call "internal" and "external." Internal criticism accepted the institution of crusading, but tried to make it better, either by denouncing the sins of crusaders, reproving their lack of fervor, or complaining about unjust taxation and the misuse of crusading funds. This was the dominant form of criticism in medieval crusading literature and it remained so among the

⁴¹ It was this situation that Bessarion addressed in the speech alluded to above at note 22.

⁴² A. M. Querini, *Diatriba praeliminaris in duas partes divisa ad Francisci Barbari et aliorum ad ipsum epistolas*, 2 vols. (Brescia, 1741–43), II, 273–4.

⁴³ G. Griffiths, "Leonardo Bruni and the 1431 Florentine Complaint against the Indulgence-Hawkers: A Case-Study in Anticlericalism," in *Anticlericalism in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. P. A. Dykema and H. A. Oberman (Leiden, 1993), 133–43.

⁴⁴ L. Gualdo Rosa, "Il Filelfo e i Turchi: Un inedito storico dell'Archivio Vaticano," *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, Università di Napoli* 11 (1964–68), 109–65.

⁴⁵ For Ficino, see below, note 107; Andrea Cambini's crusading zeal is revealed in *Commentario di Andrea Cambini Fiorentino, della origine de' Turchi* (Venice, 1541). Another Florentine literary man displeased at Lorenzo's Turkish policy was Vespasiano da Bisticci; see A. Greco, "Il Lamento d'Italia per la presa d'Otranto di Vespasiano da Bisticci," in *Otranto 1480* (as above, note 28), II, 341–59.

⁴⁶ See E. Siberry, *Criticism of Crusading, 1095–1274* (Oxford, 1985).

humanists. "External" or radical critics were much rarer. In the Middle Ages they were mostly Cathar or Waldensian heretics who opposed the very idea of Holy War on pacifist grounds, or followers of Joachim of Fiore, who believed that Holy War hindered the eschatological task of converting the Muslims. Before the sixteenth century, radical humanist critics, who openly opposed the concept of Holy War as such, were also rare. Most Italian humanists of the quattrocento were high-level bureaucrats, elite educators, or courtiers, and were therefore not in a position to launch a wide-ranging critique of the existing order. Radical critiques of papal involvement in crusade continued to be made, certainly, but not by humanists.⁴⁷

Oddly enough, it was at the papal court itself that the most striking alternatives to military action against the Turks were articulated. At least two important intellectuals of the mid-quattrocento, the canonist John of Segovia and the humanist cardinal Nicolaus Cusanus, while not explicitly opposing crusade, argued that Christianity's best defense against the Turk was persuasion and rational argument. John of Segovia proposed ecumenical dialogue (*contraferentiae*) with Islamic leaders to settle differences between the two faiths and to demonstrate the superiority of Christianity.⁴⁸ For him, to send preachers and *tractatores pacis* was the true apostolic way to deal with Islam. Cusanus developed a highly original ecumenical strategy that involved showing Jews, Muslims, Hindus, and others that their religions presupposed and implicitly contained all the essential truths of Christianity; that Christianity could provide a framework to achieve a unity of all faiths. This strategy he set out in his *De pace fidei*, written, significantly, in the four months following the fall of Constantinople. In a later work, the *Cribratio Alkorani* (1461), Cusanus used a Neoplatonic theory of textuality to find Gospel truths hidden amid the lies, contradictions, and blasphemies of the Qu'ran. His purpose was, once again, the missionary one of showing Muslims that the best parts of their religion accorded with Christianity, while the inferior parts stemmed from Muhammad's misinterpretation of divine teachings.⁴⁹

From a purely human point of view it is difficult to take quattrocento ecumenism seriously as practical policy, but it did have influence in one surprising case: that of Pope Pius II. Pius, as has been said, was the most militant crusader of the fifteenth century; as humanist and pope he composed more crusading letters, histories, and orations than any other writer of the fifteenth century. Yet in a mood of despair after the *débâcle* of the Council of Mantua, he seems to have listened briefly to the ecumenical party at the papal Curia.⁵⁰ This, at least, would be one explanation for his famous and puzzling *Letter to*

⁴⁷ See E. R. Daniel, "Apocalyptic Conversion: The Joachite Alternative to the Crusades," *Traditio* 25 (1969), 127–54. The latter part of the anonymous *consilium* published below (Text 1) shows that the papacy still felt the need to be defended from such criticism in the mid-fifteenth century.

⁴⁸ Southern, *Western Views*, 90 f; F. Babinger, "Pio II e l'Oriente maomettano," in *Enea Silvio Piccolomini—Papa Pio II: Atti del convegno per il quinto centenario della morte e altri scritti*, ed. D. Maffei (Siena, 1968), 1–13.

⁴⁹ N. Cusanus, *De pace fidei*, ed. R. Klibansky and H. Bascour, in *Opera omnia iussu et auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Heidelbergensis ad codicum fidem edita*, VII (Hamburg, 1959), and idem, *Cribratio Alkorani*, ed. L. Hagemann, in *Opera omnia*, VIII (Hamburg, 1986). John O'Malley (*Praise and Blame*, 234n) points out that, although Cusanus opposed a campaign against the Turks in 1453, in sermons of 1455–56 he described Mehmed as one of the beasts of the Apocalypse and exhorted his flock to rejoice in military victories over the Turks; see the sermons in Vatican Library, MS Vat. lat. 1245, soon to be published in vol. 18 of the Heidelberg *Opera omnia*.

⁵⁰ For Pius' state of despair after Mantua, see the *lettera adespota* printed in *Aeneae Silvii Piccolomini Senensis . . . opera inedita*, ed. J. Cugnoni (Rome, 1883), 158; and *Commentarii*, I, 460 f. For the dependence of Pius's

Mahomet, in which Pius by a variety of arguments, both religious and pragmatic, tried to convert the Great Turk to Christianity.⁵¹ One of the themes of this extraordinary composition was that “victory in war does not prove truth in religion”—indeed, for a religion to rely on the sword for its success was *prima facie* proof of its weakness as a rational system. This argument—which in the medieval period would certainly have been felt as counterintuitive—bears a striking resemblance to the late Byzantine view, described by Ihor Ševčenko, which reacted to the shock of Islamic success on the battlefield by making a strong distinction between military and “spiritual” conquest.⁵²

The usual response today is to smile at Pius’ *Letter* as absurd and unrealistic, but it should be remembered that the humanist pope was working within a well-established missionary tradition. The idea of converting a nation to Christianity by converting its rulers was a policy that had had considerable success in the history of the Church, from the time of Constantine the Great forward. Pius could point to the example of Clovis the Frank, St. Stephan of Hungary, Recared the Visigoth, and other formerly pagan monarchs whose conversion had meant the conversion of an entire people. The Christian dream of converting Islamic rulers goes back (at least) to St. Francis of Assisi, who tried to convert the Fatimid caliph of Egypt in the thirteenth century, and continued (at least) into the seventeenth century, when the Dominicans and the Russian Orthodox patriarch Filaret fought (without success) for the soul of Shah Abbas of Persia. Western scholars with access to Byzantine sources may have known the story of the Seljuk prince Izzuddin Kaykaus, who converted to Christianity and brought with him his followers, the Gagas, that is, the Christian Turks who dwelt in what is now Moldova. In Pius’ own time, one can point to at least three other scholars—George Trebizond, George Scholarios, and George Amiroutzes—who shared Pius’s delusion.⁵³ There were, after all, apparently good (though in fact specious) grounds to hope for success with Mehmed II. The Ottomans had been converted to Islam for hardly more than a century, and it is probable that a majority of the subject peoples in the lands they controlled in Mehmed’s time was still Christian. It was widely rumored that Mehmed had had a Christian mother, and the so-called “Turchetto,” an imposter accepted at the papal court as the brother of Mehmed, claimed to have converted to Christianity even before coming to the West.⁵⁴ It was even rumored that Mehmed himself had already converted secretly to Christianity.⁵⁵

Even if the pope’s letter was never actually sent, even if it always remained a “dream” of Pius II which by some accident found its way into print, as some recent scholars have believed,⁵⁶ it shows a remarkable flexibility of thought that the greatest crusading pope

letter to Mehmed on John of Segovia’s and Cusanus’ earlier writings, see F. Gaeta, “Sulla *Lettera a Maometto* di Pio II,” *BISI* 77 (1965), 127–227, and idem, “Alcune osservazioni sulla prima redazione della *Lettera a Maometto*,” in *Enea Silvio Piccolomini*, 177–86.

⁵¹ *Lettera a Maometto II*, ed. G. Toffanin (Naples, 1953).

⁵² Ševčenko, “Decline of Byzantium.”

⁵³ J. Monfasani, *George of Trebizond: A Biography and a Study of His Rhetoric and Logic*, Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 1 (Leiden, 1976), 131 ff.

⁵⁴ Sometimes called “Calixtus Ottomanus”; see G. Zippel, “Un pretendente ottomano alla Corte dei papi: il ‘Turchetto,’” in his *Storia e cultura del Rinascimento italiano*, Medioevo e Umanesimo 33 (Padua, 1979), 463–82.

⁵⁵ Babinger, *Mehmed the Conqueror*, 499.

⁵⁶ See the articles of Gaeta cited in note 50. Babinger’s article on the letter, cited in note 48, finds it to be pervaded with a sense of unreality; see also his *Mehmed the Conqueror*, 198–201.

of the fifteenth century was willing, in exchange for Mehmed's accepting "a few drops of (baptismal) water," to entertain the idea of transferring the empire from the Germans to the Turks—just as his predecessor, Leo III, had translated it from the Greeks to the Franks six and a half centuries before. It is impossible to imagine Urban II or Innocent III or other great crusading popes of the High Middle Ages expressing such views. But then Pius was, on his own view, in a much less favorable position. His situation was in some respects parallel to that of the Greeks of the late Paleologan period, who felt they were being forced to choose between preserving the empire at the cost of submission to Rome, or preserving Orthodoxy at the cost of losing their freedom to the Turk. The possibility that Mehmed II might convert to Christianity raised in acute form the question whether the West was fighting to preserve its religion or its political freedom. That Pius was willing to allow the issue to arise at all shows how hopeless he believed the situation of the Western powers to be in the face of the Turkish threat.⁵⁷

There were, to be sure, a few humanists who broke ranks with the crusading orthodoxy of the time in the most dramatic way possible.⁵⁸ These were the so-called philoturk humanists—such as Francesco Filelfo, his son Giovan Mario, Michael Critoboulos, or Giovanni Stefano Emiliano—who aspired to become courtiers of the Great Turk or who hoped to win favors from him for themselves or their patrons. George Trebizond, who went over temporarily to the Great Turk in obedience to his millenarian convictions, is perhaps a special case.⁵⁹ But it seems likely that most of these men hoped to keep their actions secret, and all of them, when their behavior became known in Western Christendom, came under sharp criticism. Francesco Filelfo had a lot of explaining to do when he returned to the West; he had secured the release of his Greek mother- and sisters-in-law from an Ottoman prison at the price of a flattering poem written to the Great Turk.⁶⁰ George Trebizond was jailed by the pope for his treasonous dealings with Mehmed II. Giovan Mario Filelfo was forced to turn the fourth book of his *Amyris* into a palindrome;

⁵⁷Another possible interpretation (which to my knowledge has not been suggested elsewhere) is that Pius intended to "leak" the letter to someone in the court of the emperor Frederick III in order to put pressure on him to engage in crusade. The letter (first published five years after Pius' death) may have found its way by devious routes into the hands of the printers, perhaps *via* Pius' favorite, the adventurer Gerard des Champs, who later became known as the printer Gherardo di Lisa di Fiandra and who himself published an edition of the letter in Treviso in 1475 (see Babinger, "Pio II," 11).

⁵⁸The idea that Mehmed II was surrounded by Western humanists has been to some extent debunked in modern times by F. Babinger, "Maometto il Conquistatore e gli umanisti d'Italia," in *Venezia e l'Oriente fra tardo Medioevo e Rinascimento*, ed. A. Pertusi, *Civiltà europea e civiltà veneziana, Aspetti e problemi* 4 (Venice, 1966), 433–49. J. Raby, "Cyriacus of Ancona and the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed II," *JWarb* 43 (1980), 242–46, has falsified the old story that Ciriaco d'Ancona worked at Mehmed's court. For Western humanists who visited Mehmed's court, see below, p. 137.

⁵⁹For Giovan Mario Filelfo and Trebizond, see further below, pp. 140–41, 142–43. On Giovanni Stefano Emiliano, see F. Babinger, "Eine Lateinische Totenklage auf Mehmed II," in *Studi orientalistici in onore di Giorgio Levi della Vida*, 2 vols., Pubblicazioni dell'Istituto per l'Oriente 52 (Rome, 1956), I, 15–31. The humanist Roberto Valturio sent a magnificently illuminated copy of his *De re militari* to Mehmed at the behest of his philoturk master, Sigismondo Malatesta; see Babinger, *Mehmed the Conqueror*, 201. For Critoboulos, see *ibid.*, ad indicem, and Pertusi, *La caduta*, II, 228–51.

⁶⁰See Schwoebel, *The Shadow*, 151n; Babinger, *Mehmed the Conqueror*, 497–98; Gualdo Rosa, "Il Filelfo e i Turchi," 112. Around the same time, Filelfo wrote a letter to a counselor of Duke Francesco Sforza recommending that he enter into secret peace negotiations with Mehmed. All of Filelfo's other numerous writings on the Turkish threat were conventionally in favor of crusade.

the first three books had praised Mehmed's conquest of Constantinople, while the last, with gross inconsistency, ended by calling on Francesco Sforza to take the Cross.⁶¹

In sum, while we cannot expect to find many humanists openly opposing crusading projects in the fifteenth century, it would be a mistake to assume that all humanists were at all times fiery advocates of crusade. Humanist advocacy of Holy War can be adequately accounted for in the context of patronage and private enthusiasm. The relative absence of opposition to crusading among humanists does not require an explanation in an age when such opposition would be seen as heterodox, and a reputation for heterodoxy carried grave disabilities at least. The hypothesis that there existed some secret affinity between the *studia humanitatis* and the crusading ideal is implausible and unnecessary. Nor can one defend the argument that the humanists favored crusade because of a parallelism between the recovery of classical antiquity and the recovery of Constantinople. Fifteenth-century humanism aimed overwhelmingly at a revival of Roman antiquity and Latin literature. Though some humanists valued Byzantium and the Byzantines for their role in the transmission of ancient learning, this was a sophisticated attitude that emerged mostly among the humanist elite. The majority of quattrocento humanists had little acquaintance with Greek. Some of them even had strong anti-Greek prejudices—as can be illustrated from the letter of Petrus Bravus against Andronicus Callistus, printed below (Text 10). Some Western humanists, like Ficino, may have resented the large salaries paid to men such as Theodore Gaza and John Argyropoulos for teaching in Western universities.⁶² Others, like Pomponio Leto, resented the special favor shown to Latin hellenists. Behind the broader general issue of how valuable the Greek heritage was to Western Latin culture, there was plenty of careerism, jealousy, and backbiting.

Yet, despite constraints on public discussion of crusading, a diversity of opinion about crusade did find expression among humanists in covert ways. Certain historical and scholarly questions of the later quattrocento were debated with a heat unusual in purely academic debates. But once it is grasped that the answers given to these questions had concrete political implications, it becomes understandable why humanists with different views on crusade would attempt to “spin” them in different ways. There are a number of humanist debates with political subtexts relating to crusade; two are illustrated below.

Who Lost Constantinople? Humanist Spin-Control

At the beginning of his dialogue *On the Misery of the Human Condition*—dedicated to Pius II's great enemy Sigismondo Malatesta—Poggio Bracciolini describes a discussion held at the house of Cosimo de' Medici shortly after the fall of Constantinople in 1453.

Several people brought up the already trite subject of the city of Constantinople and its miserable captivity, bewailing the hard and inhuman (*immanis*) cruelty of the barbarians, maddened with the slaughter and blood of Christians. Some people were exaggerating the extent of the calamity received and were afraid of future perils to Christian people unless the fire were put out by other projects and other forces. At length they came

⁶¹ See Babinger, *Mehmed the Conqueror*, 506–7, and the introduction to G. M. Filelfo, *Amyris*, ed. A. Manetti (Bologna, 1978). For the punishment of George Trebizond, see Monfasani, *George of Trebizond*, 184–94.

⁶² See J. Hankins, “The Myth of the Platonic Academy of Florence,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 44.3 (1991), 429–75.

round one by one to the view that no city in previous ages had ever experienced so dire and destructive a captivity.⁶³

The discussion continued in this vein, with the company deploring the divisions within Latin Christendom and Italy that made united action against the Turk so difficult. Soon afterwards the company broke up, but Matteo Palmieri remained behind to exchange some words privately with Cosimo. Cosimo asked him what he really thought of the claim that the fall of Constantinople was the worst calamity ever to befall Christendom. Palmieri replied that humanity compelled him to pity the Greeks, but, to tell the truth, if one considered the Greeks' doubledealing, idleness, and avarice, they had fully deserved their punishment. Cicero's oration *Pro L. Flacco* showed us what the Greeks' character was like, and Byzantine plots to destroy so many crusading armies in the past exposed their lack of true commitment to the Christian cause. Twice they had abjured the Catholic faith after professing it at councils. Their greed was so great that they refused to spend their wealth in defense of their own city, so that the Turks (by common report) had found enormous supplies of gold and silver when they plundered the city. The Greeks were always calling upon the popes to save them even though they had the resources to save themselves. "So it is not by chance, but by divine judgement that this calamity appears to have occurred." Palmieri goes on to dismiss the fall of Constantinople by arguing that many calamities in history had been far worse.

The view that the Greeks had deserved their fate, we know, was common enough in the Latin West after 1453. A culture that believed all events happened at the nod of Divine Providence naturally looked for scapegoats upon whom blame for divine punishment could be laid. But the identification of scapegoats could have important political implications. We have already seen that Orthodox clerics such as the patriarch Gennadios interpreted the fall of the city as a divine punishment for her submission to Rome. His reading of the event of course had the effect, if not the purpose, of hardening the divisions between the Greek and Latin churches. On the Latin side, the story was told in the opposite way. "It was not *unio facta* but *unio ficta* that brought the city to its fatal destruction," wrote Bishop Leonardo of Chios; "by this we may understand that the Divine Wrath, filled to overflowing in these days, has come upon them." That the fate of Constantinople was divine punishment meted out to the Greeks for their immorality, decadence, heresy, and for abetting Hussites was a major theme of Ubertino Puscolo's short Latin epic (or epyllion), the *Constantinopoleos*.⁶⁴

Hatred of the Greeks and the belief that they were well deserving of punishment at the hands of the Turks was a powerful sentiment even before the fall of Constantinople.⁶⁵ Afterwards, to blame the Greeks for their own calamity became a way of washing one's hands of responsibility. It also became an isolationist ploy to sap crusading zeal while not disagreeing publicly with crusading projects. Those who wished to fire up the spirit of

⁶³P. Bracciolini, *Opera omnia*, ed. R. Fubini, I (Turin, 1964), 88–89; the view that the fall of Constantinople was the worst disaster of all time was expressed in fra Girolamo da Firenze's letter to Cardinal Domenico Capranica, published in Pertusi, *La caduta*, I, 34; Isidore of Kiev, in *ibid.*, I, 98; and Lauro Quirini in a letter of 1453 published in Pertusi, *Testi inediti*, 74.

⁶⁴For Leonardo of Chios, see Pertusi, *La caduta*, 123–71; the text of Ubertino Puscolo's epic may be found in A. S. Ellissen, *Analekten der mittel- und neugriechischen Literatur*, III (Leipzig, 1857), 12–83.

⁶⁵See Text 1, lines 31 f and *passim*, for an example from the papal court.

crusade, naturally, were obliged to produce a competing account of where guilt lay. They had a rich field to till. Despite the widespread sense that the Greeks had gotten what they deserved, there was also a great deal of bad conscience in the West about its failure to aid fellow Christians: exclamations of shame and guilt punctuated the numerous *lamenti* for the fall of Constantinople composed (some by humanists) in Italy during the later fifteenth century.⁶⁶ Guilt could be effectively manipulated with individual Western leaders concerned about their place in history. Isidore of Kiev and Lauro Quirini argued to Nicholas V that the Church, which had received the empire from Constantine the Great, had a moral obligation to recover Constantine's city.⁶⁷ Aeneas Silvius tried to galvanize Nicholas into action by telling him that future historians would lay the blame for losing Constantinople at his door.

I am certain Your Holiness is affected with great grief and deeply deplores the outcome of this matter—and with reason . . . For all Latin writers who shall relate the deeds of the popes, when they come to your time shall write of your glory in this wise: "Nicholas, the fifth pope of that name, of Tuscany, reigned thus many years; he retrieved the patrimony of the Church from the hands of tyrants; he restored unity to a divided church; he added Bernardino of Siena to the catalog of saints; he constructed the palace of St. Peter; he restored St. Peter's basilica in a wondrous way; he celebrated the jubilee; he crowned Frederick III." They shall say all these beautiful and seemly things of your name, but what they shall add at the end will ruin everything: "but in his time the royal city of Constantinople was captured and sacked by the Turks."⁶⁸

That Nicholas V was distressed by the blot on his papacy is shown by his will, in which he tried to purge himself of any guilt for his failure to save Constantinople. But Aeneas Silvius' prophecy proved correct: his clever imitation of the *Liber pontificalis* turned out uncannily close to what was written by later historians of Nicholas' reign.⁶⁹

Slightly later Aeneas Silvius tried to widen the circle of blame. In an unfinished dialogue, Aeneas imagines himself to have fallen into a deep sleep the night before he is to give a crusading oration before Frederick III. In his dream he meets San Bernardino who leads him to the Elysian Fields, and tells him of the reaction of Constantine the Great to the conquest of his city, Constantinople, by the Turks. The following is a paraphrase of the speeches put into the mouths of Constantine and Jesus Christ by Aeneas Silvius:

⁶⁶For the many *lamenti* on the fall of Constantinople, see A. Medin and L. Frati, *Lamenti storici dei secoli XIV, XV, e XVI*, 2 vols. (Bologna, 1888; repr. 1969), II, 127 f; Iorga, *Notices et extraits*, III, 335–41; Pertusi, *La caduta*, II, 293–410; Pertusi, *Testi inediti*, 251–58, 297–304, 309–12, 339–44. The text of Vespasiano da Bisticci's prose *Lamento d'Italia per la presa d'Otranto* is in his *Vite di uomini illustri del secolo XV*, ed. L. Frati, III (Bologna, 1893), 306–25. The *lamenti* are often populist in tone, bitter at the failure of rulers to unite against the Turk.

⁶⁷Pertusi, *La caduta*, I, 58–60; idem, *Testi inediti*, 82 f. The same argument is made by the anonymous author of Text 1, lines 469 f.

⁶⁸Pertusi, *La caduta*, II, 46–48.

⁶⁹For Nicholas V's self-exculpation will, see *ibid.*, II, 144–48. In Platina's biography of him it is suggested that Nicholas may have died of depression following the conquest of Constantinople: "Nicolaus autem pontifex, sive taedio animi quod maxime cruciabatur post captam Constantinopolim, sive febri et podagra qua potissimum vexabatur, pontificatus sui anno octavo moritur"; see *Platinae historici Liber de vita Christi ac omnium pontificum*, ed. G. Gaida, RISS², III.1 (Città di Castello, 1913), 337–38. Edward Gibbon's summation of Nicholas V's reign is typical of many: in chapter 68 of his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* he wrote, "The pontificate of Nicolas the Fifth, however peaceful and prosperous, was dishonoured by the fall of the Eastern Empire."

When the Emperor Constantine learned that the city he had founded to bear his name and be the seat of the eastern Empire had fallen to the Turks, he addressed our Savior thus: "While I am deeply grateful for the many benefits and favors you showered upon me, Lord, in my life—my many victories, my conversion, my success in repressing the Arian heresy—I have been troubled and pained to learn that the city you bade me found as the capital of the Eastern Empire, the most holy city of Christendom (saving only Rome), has been occupied by the satellites of Mahomet. The famous temples where your name was praised have been polluted, the literary monuments which made my city a second Athens have been plundered, the sepulchres of my successors destroyed, the most precious holy relics have been thrown to dogs and trodden underfoot, Your image and that of Your Mother have been blotted out. I well know such things cannot please You. But how long will You allow the Turks to abuse Your patience? When will Your thunderbolt strike this wicked race? How long must those who worship You in Asia, Africa and Europe suffer the yoke of the infidel? You have permitted Mahomet's vile impiety for eight hundred years; whenever Christians have taken up arms against them, Your wrath has come down on Your own people. The Jews, who were the elect people before us, You often punished with the scourge of the Gentiles when they had transgressed against the Law; but when they cried to heaven and begged forgiveness, a savior straightway appeared who delivered them from the hand of iniquity. Why do You not now hear the voice of Your people in Asia and Greece? Help Your people! If You don't care, at least let me return to earth and hold a meeting of Christians to consult the interests of Your religion. If You have no mind to aid Christians in war, at least don't favor the Turks; be neutral; let each side be rewarded according to its fortune, its efforts, and its virtues."

When Constantine had finished, the Eternal Moderator of man and nature smiled and answered, "It was Our pleasure to confer benefits upon you, Constantine, and you repaid Our favor by destroying the cult of idols and enjoining the evangelical religion of Our messengers, Peter and Paul, upon all the peoples entrusted to you. Now you are distressed that the Turks have defeated those who worship Us, you suffer to see the city named for you in their blasphemous hands, you wonder that We do not strike down that wicked race. But the fates of men as of stars are weighed in Our balance; We have foreordained all things before the world was made. The successes of the Turks, too, we have ordained. The Turks have brought deserved punishment upon false Christian kind. For when were crimes more plentiful? When did the lap of avarice open more widely? When was lust more widespread, cruelty more inhuman? Every vice is foremost, a race has arisen deserving of another flood."⁷⁰

The fall of Constantinople was a punishment and a warning for all Christians, not just for the Greeks. It was a punishment for heresies and political divisions within Christendom.⁷¹ Western Christians should reform themselves, rededicate themselves to noble ideals such as crusading, in order to avoid further punishment at the hands of the Turks.⁷²

But the fall of Constantinople had had human as well as divine causes. Humanist historians, especially, were interested in giving credit and assigning blame to the appropriate parties in the numerous accounts they produced of the siege and fall of the city. Fingers were pointed in many different directions. For example, at one moment during

⁷⁰Cugnoni, ed., *Aeneae Silvii opera inedita*, 252–54. This dialogue was possibly the model for the *Constantinus Supplex* of Nicola Loschi, dedicated to Pius II; see Pertusi, *Testi inediti*, 270–79.

⁷¹Pertusi, *La caduta*, II, 64 (Pius II).

⁷²*Ibid.*, II, 14 (Paolo Dotti); Pertusi, *Testi inediti*, 293–96 (Roberto Caracciolo da Lecce).

the siege the Christian forces attempted to burn the Turkish fleet. While most sources agree that this attack was planned as a combined operation of Venetians, Genoese and Greeks, the Venetian Niccolò Barbaro claimed that the plan was entirely a Venetian one and was betrayed to the Turks by the Genoese, “nemigi de la fede cristiana.”⁷³ Another key point on which the historians disagreed was the famous incident involving Giovanni Giustiniani Longo, the Genoese captain-general of the defenses, who abandoned the walls at a decisive moment during the Turkish assault; as a result of his disappearance, the defenders lost heart and the Turks were able to make a breach in the walls. Most accounts of this episode say that Giustiniani had been slightly wounded and left the walls in search of a doctor. The most credible (Byzantine) sources set this misfortune down to Giustiniani’s inexperience and his consequent failure to realize the effect his unexplained disappearance would have on his troops’ morale. Western accounts, in contrast, are eager to make propagandistic use of the incident. Genoese writers like Adam of Montaldo and Angelo Lomellino exonerate Giustiniani completely—Lomellino blames the Greeks and Venetians—while Venetian sources are happy to ascribe to a hated Genoese the lowest motives of cowardice and treachery.⁷⁴ An odd variant of the tale comes from Niccolò della Tuccia of Viterbo, whose *Cronica di Viterbo* positively seeths with hatred of Florence. According to Niccolò, the real culprit responsible for the entrance of the Turks into the city was a Florentine merchant named Neri, who opened one of the gates to the Turks in return for special treatment for himself, his sons, and his goods.⁷⁵

There were other morals, too, to be drawn from the fall of the city. Writers who were anxious to secure Western intervention, such as Isidor of Kiev or Aeneas Silvius, gave long, lurid, and blood-boiling accounts of Turkish atrocities—the fifteenth-century equivalent of the CNN camera. Other writers less committed to launching a crusade reported stories about the great stores of wealth discovered by Turkish troops during the sack. The lesson was clear: the Latins had no responsibility to reconquer Constantinople on behalf of a nation that would not sacrifice to save itself. (Bessarion turned the moral around, arguing that the Latins should not make the same mistake as the Greeks, hoarding their resources until it was too late.) A favorite story of the non-interventionists was that of Megaduke Lukas Notaras, who as leader of the anti-Unionist party in Constantinople was a natural object of Western hatred. Notaras was accused of betraying the city in order to curry favor with the Turks and to preserve intact his enormous fortune. As can be seen from the passage of Poggio’s *De miseria humanae conditionis* already quoted, such tales could only cool the anger of potential crusaders in the West.

Who were the Turks? The Politics of Ethnography

Assigning blame for the loss of Constantinople had obvious implications for the politics of crusading in the later fifteenth century. Another issue entangled in politics was the question of the origins and nature of the Turks. Like Sovietologists during the Cold War, humanist scholars debated ethnographical questions in a highly politicized atmosphere. Their beliefs regarding the character of the Turks and the Turkish regime directly af-

⁷³ Pertusi, *La caduta*, I, 19 f; cf. 354–56 nn. 73–75.

⁷⁴ Lomellino: *ibid.*, I, 43; Adam of Montaldo: Pertusi, *Testi inediti*, 194.

⁷⁵ Pertusi, *Testi inediti*, 96–97.

fected the assumptions they made about future Ottoman behavior, and hence, ultimately, their policy recommendations for dealing with the Turkish threat.

The basic division among humanist scholars was between advocates of crusade who painted the Turks as the Other—inhuman barbarians thirsting for Christian blood—and philoturks and other, less open opponents of Holy War who tried to integrate the Turks somehow into Western cultural traditions. Both groups tried to sustain their characterization of the Turks by means of specious scholarly arguments regarding their origins. Since—according to the usual premodern belief—origins were destiny, and stamped an indelible character on a race, humanists on both sides felt they could strike a blow for their favored policies by establishing an origin for the Turkish nation that would harmonize with their reading of the Turks' behavior and aims. The result was a body of humanist literature *de originibus Turcarum* that begins in the 1450s and continues well into the sixteenth century.⁷⁶

Some initial sense of the development of the argument can be given by tracing the history of the Latin terms used to denote the Turks during the Renaissance.⁷⁷ In the Middle Ages, Greek chroniclers, such as Zonaras and Scylax, as well as Latin writers, such as Otto of Freising and Sigebert of Gembloux, use the term Τοῦρκοι or *Turci* to describe the Seljuk Turks; when the Ottomans first become known in Byzantium and the West at the beginning of the fourteenth century the same term continues to be used in addition to the more classical term Πέρσαι. Toward the end of the fourteenth century, the prejudices of the new humanist movement begin to make themselves felt; some humanists of Salutati's generation, fearing neologism, affect to refer to the Turks as the *Teuceri* or Trojans. Already in 1389, in a public letter written for the Signoria of Florence to the king of Bosnia, Salutati himself uses *Turchi* and *Troiani* interchangeably in elegant variation. "Behold the Teucrians," writes Salutati in a later letter, "—for thus we may call them rather than Turks, now that they have conquered Teucra, although the story is that they came down from Mount Caucasus—behold, I say, the Teucrians, a most ferocious race of men."⁷⁸ Salutati's scruple about the possible Caucasian origin of the Turks—information probably taken from Jerome and Eustathius⁷⁹—was, however, ignored by the next generation of humanists; his elegant substitution of *Teuceri* for the barbarous medieval *Turci* remained influential. Poggio Bracciolini, Bartolomeus de Jano, Leonardo Bruni, Antonio Panormita, Marsilio Ficino and other humanists regularly use the term *Teuceri* for the Turks; the term was also adopted in the bulls and breves of Eugene IV as well as in the public correspondence of Florence, Venice, and the Regno.⁸⁰ Even Isidore of Kiev (or his Latin secretary) and Nicolò Sagundino still used the term in 1453 in some

⁷⁶For the origins literature, see A. Pertusi, "I primi studi in Occidente sull'origine e le potenze dei Turchi," *Studi Veneziani* 12 (1970), 465–552, who does not, however, put these studies in a political context.

⁷⁷For a useful but incomplete account emphasizing the sixteenth-century history of the terms, see Heath, "Renaissance Scholars," passim; see also S. Runciman, "Teuceri and Turci," in *Medieval and Middle Eastern Studies in Honour of Aziz Suryal Atiya*, ed. S. Hanna (Leiden, 1972), 344–48.

⁷⁸*Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati*, ed. F. Novati, III (Rome, 1896), 208; Novati cites in the note an example of Salutati's use of *Teuceri* in his missive.

⁷⁹See Heath, "Renaissance Scholars," 460.

⁸⁰See the indices to Pertusi, *La caduta*, s.v. *Teuceri*; for examples from the public correspondence of the king of Aragon, see below, Text 4.

of their letters on the fall of Constantinople.⁸¹ Other humanists, such as Biondo Flavio and Francesco Filelfo, continue to use the older word *Turci*, largely in deference to the predominant Byzantine usage.⁸²

In the 1450s the terminology began to be politicized. Pius II, in what might be called, almost, a reverse form of “political correctness,” began to campaign vigorously against the use of *Teucrici*. Already in his famous letter to Nicholas V, written in 1453, Aeneas Silvius was complaining about the identification of the Turks with the Trojans:

Those who are now called Turks (*Turchi*) are not, as some think, the Trojans or the Persians. They are a race of Scythians from the center of Barbary; they are reported at an earlier time to have had their base beyond the Euxine and the Perichean mountains near the northern Ocean, as Aethicus the philosopher opines.⁸³

Piccolomini repeated the point in numerous letters on the Turkish threat, reproving humanists and officials everywhere for calling the Turks *Teucrici*. In 1456 Aeneas Silvius, by then a cardinal, commissioned Nicolaus Secundinus, or Sagundino, to write a work on the origins of the Turk. Sagundino, a Greek from Negroponte who had served as a diplomat for the Venetians in the court of Mehmed II, wrote what has been considered the first piece of serious research on the history of the Ottomans, the *Liber de familia Autumatorum*.⁸⁴ In this work, Sagundino identifies the Turks with the ancient tribe of the Scythians, as described in Herodotus and other ancient sources. He argues for the identification, essentially, by citing similarities in language and customs (“vitae morumque similitudo, habitus cultusque corporis, equitandi sagittandique ratio et omnino rei militaris communis quaedam et patria disciplina : . . . linguae ipsius ac usus loquendi cognatio”). Though his assertions about the barbarous mores of the Turks evidently owed more to prejudice than to observation, Sagundino’s recognized status as a “Turkish expert” gave them great weight. He thus strengthened immeasurably Aeneas Silvius’ attempt to link the Turks with the ancient Scythians. When Pius II composed his *Cosmographia* around 1458/60, he gleefully incorporated Sagundino’s research into his description of the Scythian origins of the Turk, written, as he said, “in order to confute the error of those who affirm that the Turks are of Trojan race and call them Teucricians.”⁸⁵ It was owing ultimately to the influence of Sagundino and Pius II that Western scholars down to the late nineteenth century believed the Turks to be descended from the ancient Scythians.

Aethicus, Pius II’s original source for the Scythian origins of the Turks, had used the term *Turci*, which thus became (initially) Piccolomini’s favored alternative to *Teucrici*. Sagundino, however, began to use the term *Turcae*, a first-declension masculine, rather

⁸¹ Sagundino later changed to *Turcae*; see below, p. 137–38.

⁸² For Filelfo’s usage, see below, p. 138.

⁸³ Pertusi, *La caduta*, II, 54; cf. also Pius’ *Commentarii*, I, 113. This theme is so frequent in Pius’ letters and sermons as to amount to an obsession.

⁸⁴ Sagundino’s *Liber* is in *Laonici Chalcondylae Atheniensis De origine ac rebus gestis Turcorum libri decem*, ed. C. Clauser (Basel, 1556), 186–90. On Sagundino, see F. Babinger, “Nikolaus Sagoundinos, ein griechisch-venedischer Humanist des 15. Jhdts,” *Χαριστέριον εις Ἀναστάσιον Κ. Ὀρλάνδον* (Athens, 1964), 198–212; and idem, *Johannes Darius (1414–1494)* (Munich, 1961), 9–52.

⁸⁵ *Cosmographia Pii papae* (Paris, 1509), fol. 92r.

than *Turci*, to describe the descendents of the Scythians. Sagundino does not tell us why he employed this term, but from later writers it may be deduced that he found the word had been used by the ancient geographers, especially Pomponius Mela and Pliny, to describe peoples in Scythia.⁸⁶ Hence, by the late 1450s, Pius and his followers in the papal court began to use the new locution as a shorthand to indicate their knowledge and acceptance of the new identification of the Turks with the ancient Scythians.

There was some resistance from those who put the authority of Byzantine usage ahead of ancient cosmographers writing in Latin. Theodore Gaza in his *De origine Turchorum* of ca. 1470 and Francesco Filelfo both upheld the use of the traditional term.⁸⁷ But the effect of this resistance was only further to strengthen the hypothesis of Scythian origins. Gaza felt that the spelling *Turci* should be maintained, arguing that the modern Turks should be identified with the Κούρτιοι or Cyrtii, a Persian tribe mentioned by Strabo in his *Geography* (11.13.3 and 15.3.1). Possibly he suggested this in order to reinforce his patron Bessarion's analogy between the defense of modern Greece against the Turks and the defense of ancient Greece against the Persians. But there is no evidence to support this guess.⁸⁸ In any case, no one else in the West besides Gaza found the theory attractive. Filelfo in his various writings on the crusade agreed that the Turks had had barbarian origins—he called them “slaves and shepherds of the Scythians,” going Pius II one better—but like Gaza he denied that they should be called *Turcae* rather than *Turci*.⁸⁹ He brought upon himself a violent attack from his former student Giorgio Merula, who amidst much name-calling and *ad hominem* attacks (“he fingers more prostitutes than books,” etc.) managed to make the valid points that both Pliny and Pomponius Mela had mentioned tribes of *Turcae* living, respectively, by the mouth of the Don and by the Sea of Azov, near the Caucasus.⁹⁰ Filelfo replied in kind, drawing attention to the stinking

⁸⁶Pomponius Mela, *De chorographia*, I, xix, 116; Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* VI, vii, 19; see Heath, “Renaissance Scholars,” 456 f.

⁸⁷Gaza's epistolatory treatise is in PG 161, cols. 997–1006; the treatise is dedicated to Francesco Filelfo.

⁸⁸George Trebizond on one occasion identified the Turks with the Persians (see Monfasani, ed., *Trapezuntina*, 434), whom he saw as the inveterate enemies of Greek civilization. Pletho, according to Gaza (see the text cited in note 87), identified the Turks with the Paropamisadae, a tribe from the Hindu Kush who, according to Arrian and Quintus Curtius, had been defeated by Alexander the Great and closed off by him within the Hyperborean mountains; see Heath, “Renaissance Scholars,” 459–60. Biondo Flavio (*Historiae*, [Basel, 1531], 151) and Platina (*Liber de vita Christi ac omnium pontificum*, ed. G. Gaida, RISS, III, 1 [1932], 130) also mention the theory that the Turks were among the peoples confined to the Hyperborean mountains by Alexander; the implication seems to have been that the Turkish conquest of Byzantium was the revenge of defeated peoples against the Greek descendants of Alexander. Poggio, by contrast, identifies the ancient Scythians with the modern Tartars in his *De varietate fortunae* (*Opera omnia*, II, 541). Gaza's “Cyrtii” are now, ironically, identified by some Kurdish separatists in Turkey as the ancestors of their own nation.

⁸⁹For Filelfo's views on the origins of the Turks, see, for example, his letter to Charles VII (cited above, note 23), fol. 57r: “Is [Chosroes, king of the Persians] conductis Turcis, qui tributarii et tamquam serui Scytharum intra Caucasi claustra asperrimasque cautes incolebant, Sarrhacenis occurrit.” Like Pius II, Filelfo attributes extreme savagery to Turks, “quibuscum fida pax nunquam fuit” (*ibid.*, fol. 226v). For Filelfo's sources, see Gualdo Rosa, “Il Filelfo e i Turchi,” 116 f.

⁹⁰Merula, *Epistulae duae adversus Franciscum Philelphum* (Venice: Girardengus, 1480 = Hain 11092, IGI 6379, Goff M-503; copy at Houghton Library, Harvard University, Inc 4466.5). The tone of the controversy may be sampled from a single passage: “[Philelphus] desidiae et luxuriae semper deditus et frivola doctrinae preceptor et qui plures domi meretriculas quam libros semper attractavit, miratur et immo me accusat quod gentem Turcarum dixerim.” On the controversy, see F. Gabotto and A. Badini Confalonieri, “Vita di Giorgio Merula,” *Rivista di Storia, Arte, Archeologia della Provincia di Alessandria* 2.4 (1893), 331–33.

vomit bespattering “Merdula’s” vestments, the result of the latter’s immoderate potations, etc. But Filelfo had no good authority for his own usage and was reduced to answering Merula by citing late Byzantine texts and claiming without evidence that the latter’s text of Pomponius Mela was corrupt.⁹¹ After 1480/81, most philologists and historians accepted the *Turcae* as the more “classical” usage, having the authority of the ancient geographers behind it. The few writers who still employed *Teuceri* began to look old-fashioned or ill-informed.

Why all the fuss over a name? The reason was that such names could stand for broader attitudes, beliefs, and even policy commitments. For instance, while some humanists used the term *Teuceri* merely out of a misplaced notion of classical elegance, others intended to suggest that the Turks really *were* the descendents of the Trojans, and as such had every right to vengeance against the Greeks for the burning of Troy almost twenty-five hundred years before. In Filippo da Rimini’s account of the fall of Constantinople, indeed, it is reported that, after the victory, the Great Turk violated a Greek virgin in the church of Santa Sophia, boasting that he had avenged the rape of Cassandra during the Trojan war.⁹² The more serious threat, however, was that, by identifying the Turks with the Trojans, opponents of crusade could play upon Western hatred of the Greeks and sap enthusiasm for Holy War. In the fifteenth and sixteenth century, after all, the early history of Rome and Venice were still wrapped in fable. Most classically educated Italians still believed themselves to be descended from Trojan refugees: the Romans from Aeneas, the Venetians from Antenor. According to another widely believed legend, the Trojans were themselves originally Italians led by Dardanus who had settled in Asia Minor generations before the Trojan war.⁹³ It was, moreover, an age in which the princes of northern Europe were attempting to legitimate their new claims to sovereignty by reinterpreting the legends of Troy as founding legends of various royal houses. The kings of France, England, Castile, and their humanist courtiers were busily elaborating Trojan ancestries as a way of suggesting that these kingdoms had as fair a claim to be considered empires as did ancient Rome. In the case of France, there was a tradition going back to early medieval times that a body of Trojan refugees under the command of “Francio” and “Turchot” had split up to form the ancestors of the modern Frankish and Turkish peoples.⁹⁴ Even Mehmed himself, according to his semi-official chronicler Critoboulos, was aware of the identification of Turks with Trojans; several years after the fall of Con-

⁹¹ Filelfo’s reply is in an untitled incunabulum (Hain *12965 = Goff P-604 = BMC VI 760; copy of two leaves, at Houghton Library, Harvard University, Inc 6805.5), containing a letter dated 12 November 1480 to Benedictus Aliprandus; he says of “Merdula”: “Ceterum quid cum homuncione isto contendas qui ex nimia crapula totus fetet et ex immoderata Cretensis Cipriique meri potacione qua se die noctuque obruit, semper spuit. Aspice eius pectus vestimentaue intueri; offendas omnia nimio vomitu et uncta et sordida et fetida.”

⁹² Pertusi, *Testi inediti*, 138–41 and notes.

⁹³ For the ancient sources, see *Aeneid* 3.167 and 6.650 and Servius ad loc. For the legends of ancient Rome in the Middle Ages, see C. T. Davis, *Dante and the Idea of Rome* (Oxford, 1957). For the legend of Dardanus in medieval Italy, see, for example, Giovanni Villani’s *Nuova Cronica*, ed. G. Porta, I (Parma, 1990), 13 f.

⁹⁴ Heath, “Renaissance Scholars,” 456. For France and England, see T. Spencer, “Turks and Trojans in the Renaissance,” *Modern Language Review* 47 (1952), 330–33; A. Linder, “Ex mala parentela bona sequi seu oriri non potest: The Trojan Ancestry of the Kings of France,” *Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et Renaissance* 40 (1978), 497–512; A. B. Ferguson, *Utter Antiquity: Perceptions of Prehistory in Renaissance England*, Duke Monographs in Medieval and Renaissance Studies 13 (Durham, N.C., 1993). For an overview, see P. G. Bietenholz, *Historia*

stantinople, Mehmed visited the site of Troy and, after inquiring about “Achilles and Ajax and the rest,” remarked,

It was the Greeks and Macedonians and Thessalians and Peloponnesians who ravaged this place in the past, and whose descendants have now through my efforts paid the right penalty, after a long period of years, for their injustice to us Asiatics at that time and so often in subsequent times.⁹⁵

German humanists, on the other hand, promoted another sort of anti-Greek myth by which the modern Germans and Turks had a common ancestor in the rude but virtuous Macedonians, who in ancient times had defeated the decadent Greeks. Alexander the Great had fathered the Saxon race, which subsequently had a Christian and a pagan branch; while the Christian Saxons became the modern Germans, the pagan branch fled to Sarmatia and founded the Turkish race.⁹⁶

In this context it is easy to understand Pius II's obsession with refuting the identification of Turks with Trojans. Two contemporary pieces of humanist propaganda show the dangers involved. One is a letter, published frequently with Pius II's *Epistola ad Mahometum*, purporting to be written by the Great Turk and directed to Pius.⁹⁷ In the letter “Morbisanus” expostulates with Pius for having declared a crusade against the Turks (called *Teucrici*); he argues that there are no grounds for religious war against them. The Turks are innocent of the blood of Christ, they do not possess the Holy Land, they hate Jews as much as Christians do, and their war is directed mainly against the arrogant Venetians, who had stolen islands in the eastern Mediterranean without imperial authority. A major head of his discourse is the common blood shared between Italians of the race of Aeneas and the Turks. The aim of the Turks is not world conquest but revenge for the death of Hector and the restoration of Troy.

A similar line is taken in the first three books of Giovan Mario Filelfo's epic, the

and Fabula: Myths and Legends in Historical Thought from Antiquity to the Modern Age (Leiden, 1994). An amusing instance where faked genealogies were used in support of crusading is Fichet's letter of presentation accompanying the gift of Bessarion's 1471 *Orationes* to Amadeus of Savoy. Fichet traces Amadeus' forebears back through the Ottonians to the Byzantine emperors and ultimately to Alexander the Great; this is meant to show that Amadeus is a Macedonian and, therefore, destined to reclaim Greece from the barbarians. See E. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique des XVe et XVIe siècles* (Paris, 1962), 262–68. Filelfo, insisting that the *Turci* and the *Teucrici* were distinct peoples, managed to turn the supposed Trojan ancestry of the French kings to advantage in his letter to Charles VII (*Epistolarum libri*, fol. 59v: “Sed quanto pulchrius erit et gloriosius si idem feceris in Turcos et Sarrhacenos a quibus non tua solum, sed Christi patria spoliatus sis. Quae vetus tibi patria est? Nonne Troia, quae olim Teucricia dicebatur? Ex hac enim Franco et Teucro profecti sunt, in Pannoniam primum, deinde per suos posteros in Germaniam, demum in Galliam istam transalpinam, fortissimi illi quidem et praestantissimi auctores tui nominis et generis. At hoc tempore, pro Teucricia et Troia Turciam videmus appellari, nam ii omnes qui Teucrici [Turci *edn.*] Troianique dici consueverunt, ab infami et efferata Turcorum immanitate oppressi sunt.”

⁹⁵See Critoboulos' *History of Mehmed the Conqueror*, tr. C. T. Riggs (Princeton, N.J., 1954), 181–82.

⁹⁶See F. Borchardt, *German Antiquity in Renaissance Myth* (Baltimore, 1971), 292. On p. 85, Borchardt notes that Hartmann Schedel accepted the Trojan ancestry of the Turks.

⁹⁷*Epistola Morbisani Magni Turcae ad Pium Papam II*; the first edition is that of Treviso: Gherardo di Lisa da Fiandra, 1475, printed with the letter of Pius to Mehmed. The former text, despite being printed with Pius' letter, is not a response to it, but an independent composition, probably forged by a German in the 1470s. The identification of the Turks with the Trojans is also made in the poem of pseudo-Mehmed edited below, Text 12, in explicit refutation of Pius' theory of their Scythian descent.

Amyris.⁹⁸ Filelfo had been commissioned by Othman di Lillo Freducci, an Anconitan merchant who claimed kinship with Murad II, to write the work in praise of Mehmed and to dedicate it to the sultan.⁹⁹ The epic gives a wholly different historical meaning to the rise of the Ottoman Turks. In hexameters dense with Virgilian echoes, Filelfo tells his readers that the Turks are descended from the ancient Trojans. Their war aims are not to attack Italy, populated by fellow Trojans, but to punish the Greeks and their surrogates, the Venetians. The corrupt and effeminate civilization of the Greeks is destined to be destroyed by the rude though virtuous Turks. Once upon a time, the Greeks destroyed Troy through deceit; for this the Greeks were punished by descendents of the Trojans, the Romans, who established their empire over the Greeks. But then Greece committed a second crime. It tried to strip the empire from the descendents of Aeneas and transfer it to Constantinople; it tried to control the lands belonging to the Trojan forebears of Mehmed. To Mehmed it had fallen to punish this second crime, to take back the Eastern Empire for Troy, to make the Mediterranean once more a Trojan lake. Far from being a threat to their fellow Trojans in the West, the Turks would guarantee their final victory over the Greeks as well as over the Venetians, those Trojan renegades, corrupted by long intercourse with Byzantium.

The identification of Turks with Trojans was not always to the advantage of Italian philoturks, however. When the Venetian colony of Negroponte fell to the Turk in 1470, Bessarion reminded southern Italians that that city had anciently been known as Chalcis in Euboea, and had been the mother city of the Greek colonies in Naples and Cumae.¹⁰⁰ Whether he hoped to bind the Regno to the Greek cause by reminding south Italians of their common heritage through Magna Graecia is not entirely clear. But at least one poet, Elisio Calenzio, seems to have responded to the suggestion. In his short hexameter vision-poem, the *Hector*, he imagines a ferocious and terrifying Hector risen from the grave, striding across the Mediterranean to wreak vengeance upon the Greeks for the fall of Troy:

Non patiar nostram extingui sine uindice gentem,
Antiquumque odium non tota e mente recessit.¹⁰¹

His vengeance includes the “Danai” of southern Italy, as well as Rome and Europe.

If most of the humanists who identified the Turks with the Trojans aimed to integrate them into Western traditions, thus (as it were) domesticating them, making them less of a threat, humanists such as Pius II, who insisted that they were barbarians and inhuman, were anxious to alienate them from any possible connection with Western culture; indeed, they wished to turn them into the very antitype of civilization. This characterization, too, had policy implications. Uncivilized peoples were thought to be naturally violent, wild, nomadic, incapable of living in peace with their neighbors. To form treaties with them (as many Western powers were tempted to do) was vain since they had no

⁹⁸ Filelfo, *Amyris* (cited above, note 61).

⁹⁹ Babinger, *Mehmed the Conqueror*, 506.

¹⁰⁰ *Aulae Turcicae descriptio*, II, 317 f.

¹⁰¹ *Opuscula Elisii Calentii* (Rome, 1503), sign. a1r. For the use of *Magna Graecia* by Neapolitan humanists to describe the Regno, see E. Pispisa, *Regnum Siciliae: La polemica sulla intitolazione*, Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani, Supplementi, Serie mediolatina e umanistica 4 (Palermo, 1988), 54, 107, 122.

conception of keeping faith and no knowledge of nor respect for the law of nations.¹⁰² That equally “barbarous” behavior might have been illustrated a hundred times over by the dealings of European states with each other did not seem to alter the case.

Identifying the Turks with the Scythians also meant that a whole tradition within ancient Greek literature beginning with Herodotus could be brought to bear in the task of demonizing the Turk. Biondo Flavio, indeed, went so far as to invent a kind of “barbarian tradition.” In his treatise *De gestis Venetorum*, a tract in which Biondo uses history to advise the Venetians on crusading policy, Biondo attempts to show that the Scythians, the Goths, the Huns, the Saracens, and the Turks were kindred races, all coming from the same part of the world, and that they had always been the historical enemies of Greco-Roman civilization. Venice, by contrast, had always been both the historical refuge for the victims of barbarism and the historical opponent of barbarism. Biondo passes over in silence the tale of Venice’s founding by Antenor, but emphasizes the ancient ties with Constantinople and reminds the Venetians how the emperor Theodosius long before had sent a relief expedition to aid Venice and Italy against the Saracens.¹⁰³

The belief in a “barbarian tradition” of which the Turks were part might be regarded as a kind of humanist version of Western millenarianism, but in practice the humanists frequently integrated the Turks into more traditional forms of chiliastic speculation as well. Whether one thought of the Turks as Scythians or Trojans, ways could be found of linking these peoples with the biblical peoples of Gog and Magog or with the Ishmaelites. This link was being made already in the fourteenth century, long before the humanists came on the scene, but some humanists were not reluctant to incorporate millenarian language into their own writings.¹⁰⁴ The humanist pope Nicholas V called Mehmed II, reasonably enough, the Second Muhammad, and identified him with the Beast of the Apocalypse.¹⁰⁵ Isidore of Kiev announced that he was the precursor of Antichrist.¹⁰⁶ Marsilio Ficino, speaking for a council of four astrologers and prophets, predicted to Pope Sixtus IV in 1478 that after two years of plague, famine, war, and barbarian invasion, God himself, the heavens, and the winds would come down and defeat the Trojan barbarians, that the age of iron would turn to gold, and that Sixtus would preside over a great worldwide religion.¹⁰⁷ George Trebizond, the most interesting of the humanist millenarians, engrafted the Great Turk onto the pseudo-Methodian tradition of chiliasm, declaring that henceforward Mehmed would be known as Manuel: he would be converted to Christianity and would bring all peoples under his single rule of justice. The Western

¹⁰²For Pius II’s disgust at the “turpe fedus” of the Venetians with the Turks (“tantam inesse potenti populo ignaviam”), see his *Commentarii*, I, 132.

¹⁰³B. Flavio, *De gestis Venetorum* (Verona: Boninus de Boninis de Ragusa, 1481 = Hain-Copinger 3243*, Goff B-702, IGI 1760), fol. 14r-v: “Satis multis pro tempore sed paucioribus fortasse quam multi fieri oportuisse sunt opinati. Ostensum est urbem Venetam divina potius quam humana ope ideo condi coepisse ut barbaris, Christianae fidei et religionis hostibus, adversaretur, ut profugis ab Hunnorum Ostrogothorum Langobardorum Ungarorum Sarracenorum et demum Turchorum ac etiam a Christiano abutentium nomine tyrannorum facie ac persecutionibus confugium apud uos, portus, asilum et quietis refrigerique et salutis arx et domicilium sine muro, sine portis die noctuque pateret.”

¹⁰⁴For an example of the insertion of the Turks into the Joachimite millenarian tradition, see Text 7, below; for humanist millenarian beliefs, see also Text 9.

¹⁰⁵See O. Raynaldus, *Annales ecclesiastici*, ed. J.-D. Mansi, IX (Lucca, 1752), 616.

¹⁰⁶Pertusi, *La caduta*, I, 82.

¹⁰⁷See the letter to Sixtus IV in M. Ficino, *Opera omnia* (Basel, 1876; repr. Turin, 1959), 813–15.

church had forfeited its right to authority since it had fallen into the clutches of evil Platonists (who had once been the downfall of Greece); Mehmed, trained like Alexander the Great in the true philosophy of Aristotle, would restore philosophical health to Christianity and peace to the world.¹⁰⁸

As the example of Trebizond shows, the debate about the nature of the Turks could also be conducted on an individual level, namely, as a debate about the character and intentions of the Great Turk himself. This discussion, too, had obvious implications for Western policy. The full range of possibilities was scouted, from the view of Leonardo Dati that Mehmed was the tool of the Devil¹⁰⁹ to the belief of George Trebizond (in his philoturk period) that he was God's anointed. Other humanist philoturks, such as Francesco Berlinghieri, compared the Turk to Alexander, Caesar, and Pompey and complimented him on his daily reading of Arrian and Plutarch. But Mehmed's reputation as a student of the classics could cut both ways: philoturks used it as a way of showing that Mehmed was an enlightened Renaissance prince, with whom one might do business, while humanist crusaders cited his admiration of Alexander the Great and other conquerors as an ominous sign of his aggressive intentions. Humanists who favored crusade compared Mehmed to Hannibal, Philip of Macedon, Xerxes, Darius, Pyrrhus, or Caligula, depending on their audience and the context. While some professed to admire him, most emphasized his savage cruelty and hatred of Christianity. Francesco Filelfo in 1451 saw the Turk as weak and dissolute and therefore easily beaten; the Christian prince who challenged him had but to hold out his hand for the ripe fruit to fall into it. After the fall of Constantinople this view was more difficult to sustain; later humanists stressed the need for vigorous combined action to overcome this most powerful and brilliant of military leaders.

It would be wrong to suggest that there was always a one-to-one correspondence between a given humanist's description of the Turks and his political attitudes toward them. Ubertino Puscolo, for example, though passionately anti-Greek, is nevertheless inclined to demonize the Turks; Adam of Montaldo uses the term *Teuceri* but still maintains that the Turks are barbarians; Pius II allowed his anti-Greek prejudices to show through in a number of speeches, thus weakening his rhetorical effectiveness. But in general there is a close relationship between politics and ethnography during this period on matters Turkish. Since, as we now know, all humanist ethnographical beliefs about the Turks were mistaken, one is left wondering to what degree the humanists themselves believed in their own scholarly conclusions. Sagundino, for example, as a former resident of Mehmed's court must have been conscious at some level that the account of Turkish mores upon which he based his comparison with the Scythians was inaccurate. So, while it is tempting to read the shift from identifying the Turks as "Trojans" to identifying them as "Scythians" as an instance of scholarly progress—a learned search into ancient geographical sources to solve an ethnographic problem—the more plausible interpretation turns out to be more complicated. The account given above suggests, perhaps

¹⁰⁸ Monfasani, *George of Trebizond*, 133–35; Hankins, *Plato*, I, 167 f, and II, appendix 14. For other millenarian speculation connected with Mehmed and the fall of Constantinople, see A. Pertusi, *Fine di Bisanzio e fine del mondo: Significato e ruolo storico delle profezie sulla caduta di Constantinopoli in Oriente e in Occidente*, ed. E. Morini (Rome, 1988).

¹⁰⁹ For Dati, see Text 2.

crudely, that the shift should be interpreted primarily in political terms. But the political and the “scholarly” accounts of the shift are by no means mutually exclusive. If we doubt Sagundino’s own complete honesty and point to the political pressures to produce a particular interpretation, we can still believe that those who had no way of judging Sagundino’s information were right to trust his account *de originibus Turcarum* as the more reliable in appearance. Similarly, that Europe continued to accept the Scythian or Caucasian hypothesis well into modern times can no doubt be set down partly to European ethnocentrism, but it was also the best scholarly opinion available until the later eighteenth century. In any case, we have a sobering reminder that humanist learning in the Renaissance was hardly the detached, objective style of inquiry it is often presented as in the older literature and in some other writings of more recent date.

III. CONCLUSION

One major historical fact should not be lost sight of in assessing humanist crusading literature in the time of Mehmed II: the humanists failed. They did not succeed in effecting a change of heart within Christendom; no great pan-European crusade was launched between the accession of the Conqueror in 1451 and his death in 1481. As Gibbon wrote in the sixty-seventh book of his great history:

In the eleventh century, a fanatic monk could precipitate Europe on Asia for the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre; but in the fifteenth, the most pressing motives of religion and policy were insufficient to unite the Latins in the defense of Christendom.

How much the humanists themselves are to be blamed for this failure and how much should be set down to immutable circumstance is an unanswerable question. The humanists who promoted crusade faced a kind of collective-action dilemma familiar to diplomats in all ages: while common action was to everyone’s benefit, individual action in the common cause was severally disadvantageous. The humanists tried to resolve the dilemma using all the resources of rhetoric and all their mastery of ancient myth and history. They tried to link the interests of Greek and Latin Christendom by appeals to ancient kinship, common religion, and historical examples of cooperation and mutual benefit. The analogy could be made to modern American diplomacy, which in the case of the English invokes a “special relationship” cemented by kinship and language; with the Germans, Saxon virtue and the Protestant religion; with the French, a mutual devotion to liberty and the memory of successful common action at the time of the American Revolution. In the Renaissance as in modern times such linkages could be readily countered by invoking opposite stories of ancient enmities or by out-group stereotyping. Then, as now, such rhetorical strategies could have had little impact on actual policy when compared with the concrete interests of sovereign entities bent on enlarging their wealth and power. But it should not be assumed that humanist writings on crusade, despite the failure to achieve their political aims, were therefore utterly without importance.

It could be argued, for example, that the humanists, by the (generally) more secular and practical tone of their crusading rhetoric, helped prepare the ground for Reformation thinkers such as Luther, who, rejecting papal authority, tried to decouple *Kreuzzug*

from *Turkenkrieg*.¹¹⁰ The new humanistic analysis of foreign policy in terms of concrete, material interests and the balance of power made it possible to conceptualize the Turks as part of the state system of early modern Europe; Lorenzo de' Medici's secret understanding with the Turk at the time of Otranto proved to be the forerunner of Francis I's philoturk politics in the early sixteenth century.¹¹¹ Then, too, the tendency of some (by no means all) humanist discourse to reduce ideological polarities made European intellectuals less satisfied with the ethnocentric caricatures of Islam current in earlier times and helped create an atmosphere in which genuine historical and ethnographical research could flourish. The great sixteenth-century European collections of *Turcica* have their roots in the writings of Italian humanists of the quattrocento; and disfigured though they be with prejudice, they remained for long the best sources on early Turkish history, sources to which even the Ottomans themselves were obliged to turn when at length they became interested in their own history.¹¹²

The most important effect of humanist crusade literature, however, was its impact on Europe's sense of its own cultural identity. In antiquity, St. Paul had said that in Christ "there is neither Jew nor Greek, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free." Yet the distinction between barbarism and civilization continued to be invoked nonetheless by early Christian writers down to the end of the patristic age. In the early medieval period, the distinction became less meaningful with the conversion of the barbarians to Christianity. The term "barbarism" continued to be used by grammarians to denote bad usage, but it lost its political sense. In the High Middle Ages the Crusades were seen primarily as the reconquest and purification of the Holy Sepulchre, and the differences between Christianity and Islam were conceptualized overwhelmingly in religious terms. Christendom and Islam were, in the minds of intellectuals at least, ideologically polarized, mutually exclusive concepts.

In the fifteenth century the distinction between civilization and barbarism was revived and used to whip up military zeal against the Turks in a period when balance-of-power politics, increased mercantile contact with Islam, and religious crisis had sapped the older crusading zeal. To cast the Muslim enemy as a barbarian had been less than convincing so long as he was identified with the polished, wealthy, and settled peoples of the Near East. But when the Ottoman Turks took over the leadership of Islam in the fourteenth century, the identification of non-Christians with barbarians began to look more plausible. At the same time, Christendom, the *respublica Christiana* of the High Middle Ages, was beginning to alter its identity as well. With the discrediting of the universal institutions of the High Middle Ages, Europeans began to adopt a more secular identity. As Denys Hay has argued, the fifteenth century was the decisive period for the appearance of the modern idea of Europe and its victory over the older concept of *Christianitas*.¹¹³ With the Renaissance, too, western Europe recovered the ancient myths of

¹¹⁰See K. M. Setton, "Lutheranism and the Turkish Peril," *Balkan Studies* 3 (1962), 133–68.

¹¹¹Lorenzo's philoturk diplomacy was itself to some extent anticipated by Sigismondo Malatesta of Rimini; see Babinger, *Mehmed the Conqueror*, 201 f.

¹¹²For *Turcica* collections, see C. Göllner, *Turcica: Die europäischen Turkendrücke des XVI. Jahrhunderts*, 2 vols. (Bucharest-Berlin, 1961–68); their use by Ottoman historians: H. Inalcik, "The Rise of Ottoman Historiography," in *Historians of the Middle East*, ed. B. Lewis and P. M. Holt (London, 1962), 152–67.

¹¹³D. Hay, *Europe: The Emergence of an Idea* (Edinburgh, 1957), chaps. 4–6. For the meaning of *barbarus* in the Middle Ages, see L. Van Acker, "Barbarus und seine Ableitungen im Mittellatein," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 47 (1965), 125–40.

Persian “barbarism” arrested by Greek valor and Roman power as the agent of civilization. Under pressure from the Turkish threat, the humanists in their various crusade writings breathed new life into these myths, reinterpreting the traditional concept of Holy War as a defense of civilization against barbarism—of peaceful, industrious, cultivated folk against naturally warlike savages. In a period when Islam had ever fewer active links with the heritage of classical antiquity, Europe began to see itself as the unique heir to Greco-Roman culture, and therefore uniquely civilized and uniquely entitled, even obligated, to spread civilization throughout the world. Already by the sixteenth century, the humanist claim that European societies shared a kind and level of civility higher than that of other, “barbarian” societies had turned into a justification of European imperialism.¹¹⁴ As it is widely believed that Europe’s cultural arrogance in the modern period was a product of her technological superiority and the success of her imperial ventures, it is interesting to see that, in fact, her fantasy of embodying a higher civilization was born precisely in the period when European Christianity came closer to extinction than at any time since 732 when Charles Martel turned back the armies of Islam at the Battle of Poitiers. It is rash to draw inferences from a single instance, but perhaps one may suggest that the illusion of superiority, the belief—however misguided—in the higher value of one’s own civilization, is not a result, but a necessary precondition for success in the violent games of geopolitics.

Harvard University

¹¹⁴See A. Pagden, “Dispossessing the Barbarian: The Language of Spanish Thomism and the Debate over the Property Rights of the American Indians,” in *The Languages of Political Theory in Early-Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1987), 79–98.

APPENDIX

AN ANTHOLOGY OF INEDITED CRUSADING TEXTS (S. XV 3/4)

Conspectus:

1. Anon., <*Consilium in quo quaeritur utrum Romana ecclesia debeat Graecis praestare auxilium ut ciuitas eorum Constantinopolitana seruetur*> (December 1452)
2. Leonardus Datus, *Carmen ad Nicolaum Papam V in Thurcum Mahomet* (1453/54)
3. Georgius Vallagussa, *Epistolae duae contra Turcum* (1453/59)
4. Antonius Beccadellius Panormitanus, <*Epistolae pro parte Alfonsi et Ferdinandi regum contra Turcas*> (April 1454–before February 1459)
5. Hieronymus Guarinus, *Contra Magni Turchi Maumethi Othman impetum cohortatio ad Nicolaum V* (1 August 1454)
6. Adam de Montaldo, *Cohortatorii uersus ad papam Calixtum pro Constantinopoli* (1455/56?)
7. Pseudo-Faustus, *Profetia della venuta del Gran Turco* (1456?)
8. Nicolaus Perottus, *Oratio De assumptione beatae Mariae uirginis Mantuae in sacello summi pontificis* (15 August 1458)
9. Anonymous prophecy found in a humanistic manuscript (1458–64)
10. Petrus Bravus Veronensis, *Inuectiua in Andronicum Callistum* (1460s?)
11. Pseudo-Mehmed II, Letter to Ferrante I of Aragon, with reply (after 1470)
12. Pseudo-Mehmed II, *Responsio Magni Turci ad Pium summum pontificem* (before 1474)

In editing the following texts, the predominant spelling of the MSS. has been followed. The punctuation and capitalization are those of the editor.

1. Anon., <*Consilium in quo quaeritur utrum Romana ecclesia debeat Graecis praestare auxilium ut ciuitas eorum Constantinopolitana seruiatur*> (December 1452)

This anonymous text, first cited by Pastor a century ago but still unpublished, is preserved in a single, highly corrupt manuscript. It is of considerable interest in that it gives some impression of the empty debates going on at the papal court on the eve of the fall of Constantinople. The author is unknown, but he was probably a Dominican canon lawyer; the sources cited and the rather rhetorical exhortation concluding the text show that he had been influenced by the new humanist culture.

MS: Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense, MS 1406 [olim D.I.20], fols. 8ra–14rb (mechanical numeration). Cart., misc., s. XV. Double columns. [III] (modern, added by the binder) + II (cart., s. XVII) + 329 fols. (cart., some restored, modern mechanical foliation; also pagination [pp. (10) + 647, fol. 69 repeated], added in s. XVII) + III (modern, added binder). Modern leather binding; restored by Santin (s. XX, Rome). 425 × 290 mm. Blue and red penwork initials; one painted initial, fol. 8ra (probably Roman). Two contemporary hands: Hand I (semigothic): fols. 1ra–40vb; Hand II (gothic): fol. 40vb–322rb. Colophon, fol. 322rb: “Opus 1470, die secunda Augusti completum hora Veneris sole existente in Leone in gradu 16, minuto 11, secundo 34, per me Aurelium Cornelium physicum Romanum ad instanciam Reuerendissimi in Cristo patris et domini domini Johannis Baptiste de Sabellis, sacrosancte Romane ecclesie prothonotarii, legati Bononie dignissimi et benemeriti.” The contents are mostly works of canon law and treatises on canonical subjects from the first half of the fifteenth century.

BIBL: L. von Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste im Zeitalter der Renaissance*, 11th ed. (1955), 1: 605–8; P. O. Kristeller, *Iter Italicum*, 6 vols. (London-Leiden, 1963–92), 2: 101.

Ad laudem et honorem domini nostri Jesu Christi, anno eiusdem millesimo quadringentesimo quinquagesimo secundo mense Decembris.

Quoniam a compluribus tam ex ciuitate Constantinopolis quam ex aliis partibus orientis fide dignis asseritur ciuitatem eandem sine Christianorum auxilio perituram et in Teucrorum seruitutem redigendam, quoniam a multis multa dicuntur uarieque hominum sunt
5
opinionum utrum per Christianos auxilia illis danda sint — aliorum namque firma et constans sententia esse uidetur <ut> Grecis siue prefato ciuitati nullatenus subueniendum huiusmodique sententiam pluribus rationibus et autoribus muniunt, aliorum autem aduersa
10
penitus et omnino contraria sententia est, ut prefatis Grecis maxime petentibus subsidium per Christianos, quantum Deus <eos> iuuare dignabitur, subueniendum sit, et eo maxime
15
quia per imperatorem et patriarcham cum maxima instantia auxilium petitur et requiritur, asserentes firmiter hanc esse unicam uiam unionis perficiende uel Christianorum concilio rebelles et contumaces reprimendi — ideo decreui quam breuius potero ad utramque partem aliquid adducere, postmo<dum> quid mihi uideatur, submittens omnia iudicio sanctissimi domini nostri, qui in lege Domini doctissimus est et de iure omnia iura in scrinio peccatoris censetur habere, immo cuiuscumque alto arbitrio melius sencientis. Ego enim solum testes adducam, et prefati sanctissimi domini nostri aliorumque sit (et esse protestor) de fide testium iudicare, approbans quod approba<n>t et reprobans quod reproba<n>t. Et ut melius et clarius uideantur que dicenda sunt formabo tria dubia:

4 in] ibi MS 5 seruitutem] seuitem MS; cf. lin. 273 a multis quia MS 6 auxilio MS aliorum] quorum MS
9 omnino] oratio MS 12 concilio] auxilio MS 16 altius MS

[1] Utrum Christiani teneantur ex debito caritatis imminente hac necessitate
petentibus Grecis subuenire. [2] Utrum Grecis negligentibus salutem suam et spiritualem et
temporalem, posito quod ita sit quod huiusmodi necessitas immineat, teneantur Christiani
illis opem afferre. [3] Utrum sum<m>us pontifex pre ceteris regibus et principibus Chris-
tianis teneatur et obligetur ad premissa.

[1a] *Quantum ad primum.* <Quod auxilium non sit praestandum argumenta sex. 25

Primo. Videtur quod Grecis non sit auxilium aliquod prestandum. Hereticis et scismaticis et
excommunicatis non est comunicandum et multo minus auxilium prestandum. /8rb/ Penis
potius, tormentis, carcere coercendi sunt, prout utriusque iuris leges et canones satis do-
cent. Sed Greci sunt eiusmodi, ergo eis non est prestandum auxilium. Dignum est enim ut
mali meriti perpetua egestate laborent et “resecande <sunt> putride carnes et scabiosa ouis 30
a caulis repellenda,” ut beatus Ieronimus dicit, xxiii, qu. iii, <Re>secande sunt. Et xi, qu. iii,
dicit Augustinus: “Omnis Christianus qui a sacerdotibus excommunicatur Sathane traditur.
Quomodo? scilicet quia extra ecclesiam est dyabolus, sicut in ecclesia Christus, ac per hoc
quasi dyabolo traditur qui ab ecclesia<tica> comunione remouetur. Unde illos quos Aposto-
lus Sathane traditos esse predicat, a se excommunicatos esse demonstrat,” et in pluribus aliis 35
capitulis ibidem.

Secundo. “Quecumque scripta sunt, ad nostram doctrinam scripta sunt,” ut ait Aposto-
lus, ad Romanos xv. Et Joannes xiii: “Exemplum enim dedi uobis, ut quemadmodum ego
facio, ita et uos faciatis.” “Si Christum suscitassem mortuos legimus, in errore mortuos absolu-
isse non legimus:” ita enim dicit Gelasius papam, xxiii q ii *Legatur*. Greci autem sunt mortui 40
in erroribus suis, ergo nec absoluendi nec iuuandi; si indigni sunt beneficio spirituali, multo
magis beneficio corporali.

Tertio. Ingratis et pestilentibus uiris non sunt prestanda beneficia. Dicit enim Gregorius:
“Sicut boni per contumelias meliores existunt, ita semper reprobi de beneficio peiores fiunt.”
Et Bernardus: “Ingratitudo inimica est anime, exinanitio meritorum, uirtutum dispersio, 45
beneficiorum perditio, uentus urens, siccans fontem pietatis, rorem misericordie et fluentia
gratie.” Sed Greci sunt tales, ergo etc. Ipsi namque homines ingratisissimi, etsi multa beneficia
receperint ab ecclesia latina et ceteris regibus ac principibus Christianis, antiquis temporibus
et modernis, semper tamen fuerint et nunc esse uidentur inmemores ingentium omnium
beneficiorum, et continuo malis mala addendo, usque ad penam dicitur Deus eos misisse, ut 50
fortes sint in eorum erroribus.

Quarto. “Dampnationis sententia non est relaxanda uolenti in sua perfidia permanere,”
ut ait beatus Leo, xxiii, qu. ii., *Dampnationis*. Dicit insuper Gregorius, xxxi *Moralium*: “Volu-
issent si potuissent iniqui sine fine uiuere ut potuissent sine fine peccare. Ostendunt enim
quia in peccatis semper uiuere cupiunt qui dum uiuunt peccare non desinunt.” Cum igitur 55
a pluribus iam annorum tercenis scismatici fuerint, uidetur quod semper uelint in eorum
scismate permanere quia qui semel malus, semper presumitur malus in eodem genere mali.
Multo magis qui multiplicatis uicibus extitit malus.

Quinto. Ad uirtutem pertinet sumere uindictam de malis, ut deducit sanctus Thomas,

30–31 Gratianus, *Decretum*, 2.24.3.16 = *Corpus iuris canonici*, ed. Friedberg (Leipzig, 1879), col. 995 32–35 *ibid.*,
2.11.3.32 = ed. cit., col. 653 37 Rom. 15:4 38–39 Jo. 13:15 39–40 Gratianus, 2.24.2.2 = ed. cit., col. 984
44 s. Gregorius Magnus, *XI Homil. in Euang.* 2, hom. 18, c. 2 45–47 s. Bernardus Claraualis, *Serm. in Cant. cantic.* 51.6,
ed. Mabillon, col. 2975 52 Gratianus, 2.24.2.5 = ed. cit., col. 986 53–55 s. Gregorius Magnus, *Mor.* 34.19.36 =
CCSL 143B: 1759 59 s. Thomas Aquinas, *S. T.* 2a 2e, qu. 108, art. 1–2 = *Op. omni.*, ed. Freté et Maré, 4:153–55

30 referendo MS ouis] eius MS 33 Christianus MS 49 ingenti et omni MS 50 poemiam MS Deus eos]
deos MS

2a 2e, qu. cviii, art. i et ii. Sed Greci sunt et fuerunt mali, ergo postquam ab aliis non
 corriguntur, a Teucris tamquam instrumentis diuine iustitiae corrigi per/8va/mittendum est.
 Cum Teucris non sint magis expertes a ministerio iustitiae quam elementa uel bruta animalia,
 sed elementa sunt aliquando accepta ut instrumenta diuine iustitiae ut patet de igne, iiii Re-
 gum i, qui ad uocem Helie duos quinquagenarios cum suis consumpsit, patet et de aqua
 que Egiptios absorbit, Esodi xiiii, et de duobus ursis qui <per> maledictionem Helisei
 interfecerunt XLII pueros, iiii Regum ii, et de multis aliis, ergo multo magis Teucris possunt
 esse ministri ordinate iustitiae contra Grecos.

Sexto. Dicit Ambrosius, xxiii, qu. iiii: “Est iniusta si quis latronem, filiis deprecantibus
 motus et lacrimis coniugis eius flexus, absoluendum putat, cui latrocinandi adhuc aspi-
 ret affectus. Nonne innocentes tradet exitio, igitur, qui liberat multorum exitia cogitantem?”
 Sed Greci contra Latinos semper aspirant et mala cogitare uidentur. Igitur eos iuuare esset
 Latinorum exitium procurare.

[1b] *In contrarium.* <Quibus rationibus Graeci auxiliandi sunt.>

Videtur quod Greci sunt uis omnibus et modis possibilibus <auxiliandi>. Nam quilibet
 Christianus tenetur ex precepto diuino diligere proximum sicut se ipsum, Matt. v. Ymmo et
 Saluatoris precepto tenemur inimicos diligere. Sic enim ait, Luce vi: “Diligite inimicos
 uestros et benefacite hiis qui oderunt uos.” Igitur non obstante Grecorum scismate et ingrati-
 tudine eosdem iuuare tenemur. Alios autem scismaticos uel hereticos, nostros inimicos et
 nos odio habentes, diligere iubemur. “Diligite inimicos uestros et benefacite hiis qui oderunt
 uos” ut dictum est, et maxime imperator<i>, patriarche et aliis quam plurimis auxilium
 petentibus. Et licet ante Euangelium preceptum illud ad dilectionem inimicorum se non
 extenderet, Saluator tamen noster in noua lege addidit. Unde ex hiis tribus maxime obligari
 uidemur ad prestanda subsidia Grecis: primo, ex precepto proximi in comuni; secundo, ex
 precepto in speciali de dilectione inimicorum; tertio, si uolumus consequi promissa Domini
 diligentibus inimicos. Phariseo enim querenti quid agendo uitam eternam mereretur, re-
 spondit Saluator noster, Luce x: “‘Diliges dominum deum tuum, etc., et proximum tuum
 sicut teipsum.’ Ille uero uolens iustificare se ipsum et dixit, ‘Quis est meus proximus?’” cui
 Saluator respondens parabolam dixit Samaritani qui incidit in latrones. Super qua Au-
 gustinus, primo De doctrina Christiana: “Quod autem nullum hominem exceperit qui pre-
 cipit proximum diligere, Dominus in parabola semiuiui relictus ostendit, eum dicens proxi-
 mum qui erga illum extitit misericors, ut intelligamus proximum cui exhibendum misericor-
 die esset offitium, si indigeret. Quod nulli negandum esset, quis non uideat? dicente /8vb/
 Domino: ‘Benefacite hiis qui oderunt uos.’” Preterea idem Augustinus super illa interroga-
 tione Domini, Quis horum trium proximus tibi uidetur esse qui incidit in latrones? “Ex hoc
 igitur intelligamus eum esse proximum cui [ad] exhibendum est offitium misericor-
 die, si indiget; proximi enim nomen ad aliquid est, nec quisquam esse proximus nisi proxi-
 mo potest.” Cum igitur subuenire proximo et oppresso inter opera misericordie compu-
 tetur, a quibus nullus excipitur, uidetur quia Grecis et oppressis sint officia misericordie
 impendenda. Preterea Theophilus dicit, Luce x: Saluator autem non artibus et dignitatibus,
 sed natura determinant<ibus> proximum quoque dicit: Non putas quod, quamuis iustus

63–64 4 Reg. 1:9–12 65 Ex. 14 66 4 Reg. 2:24 68–70 Gratianus, 2.23.4.33 = ed. cit., col. 915 75 Matt.
 5:44; uid. et Lu. 10:27 76–77 Lu. 6:27 79–80 Lu. 6:27 86–87 Lu. 10:27, 29 89–93 s. Augustinus, *De doct.*
chris. 1.31 = CCSL 32: 24 94–97 *ibid.*

69 inflexus *ed.* absoluendi *MS* aspirat *MS* 80 patriarcha *MS* 89 hominum *ed.* 91 misericordie] nunc
MS 92 indiget *ed.* 95 eam *MS* 96–97 proximo] proxima *MS* 98 uidere *MS* 100 dicat *MS*

sis, nullus tibi sit proximus. Omnes enim qui eandem naturam communicant proximi sunt. Fias igitur et tu eorum proximus, non loco sed affectu.

Sequitur itaque quod Greci, licet suis actibus nostrum amorem <non> mereantur, licet eorum non moueat nos dignitas, tamen quia nostri sunt consortes nature, nostri proximi sunt quos diligere eisque subuenire tenemur. Etsi inimici sunt nostri, etsi a nobis diuisi, 105 quantum tamen nobis est possibile, ut saluari possint iuuare eos debemus. Tollitur autem hoc per Teucros, tum quia infirmos ex eis fame et tormentis ad negandam fidem et blasphemandum nomen Christi quodammodo cogunt, tum etiam quia si qui sunt ex eis heretici, si uiuerent, forte conuerterentur ad fidem. Unde de eorum morte tanto amplius dolendum est quanto in peiori statu moriuntur. Beatus enim Gregorius, Epistola lxxxiii, audita peste 110 quam in ciuitate Narnie uigebat suis temporibus, episcopum ciuitatis a<d>monuit ad predicandum fidem gentilibus et hereticis illic degentibus, dicens: “Sic enim aut diuina misericordia pro sua eis forsitan conuersione et in hac uita subueniet aut, si eos migrare contigerit, a suis, quod magis optandum est, transeunt facinoribus absoluti.” Nec debet quisquam, propter argumenta in contrarium a principio facta, dicere quod Greci scismatici et heretici numquam conuertentur, cum experientia sit in contrarium quod indies aliqui conuertuntur et 115 fiunt optimi Christiani. Ut Augustinus ait contra Donastistas: “De conuersione autem nullius desperandum est siue foris siue intus constituti, quamdiu patientia Dei ad penitentiam <eos> perducit, et uisitat in uirga facinora eorum et in flagellis peccata <eorum>. Hoc enim modo misericordiam suam non dispergit ab eis, si et ipsi aliquando misereantur anime 120 sue placentes Deo.” Siue igitur Greci scismatici siue catholici, odio nos habeant uel non habeant, eorum naturam fouere debemus ne pereant, ne eos spiritualiter et corporaliter mori contingat.

Preterea certum est quod si aliqua ciuitas Occidentis esset in eodem periculo con/9ra/stituta (quod absit) et Grecos credens auxilium prestare <posse>, uellet ut Greci subuenirent 125 eisdem, sic et nos illis prestare debemus. Ita enim Dominus mandat, Luce vi, prout multis: “Ut faciant uobis homines et uos facite illis similiter.” Super quo Crisostimus inquit: “Ostendit Christus quod nihil statuit nostram naturam transcendens, sed quod dudum inseruit conscientie nostre, docet ut propria uoluntas pro lege sit tibi, ut si bene uis tibi, bene facias aliis, et si uis ut alius tui misereatur, proximi misere.” Preterea sanctus Thomas, 2a 130 2e, qu. xxv, art. vi, et qu. xxxi, art. ii, in solutione ii articuli, utrum sint diligendi peccatores et sit subueniendum illis, dicit quod “inquantum peccatores sunt, non sunt diligendi, sed inquantum homines sunt et quia possunt non esse peccatores, diligendi sunt. Et quod non est subueniendum peccatori quantum ad fomentum culpe, sed quantum ad sustentationem nature et quod excommunicatis et rei publice hostibus imminente necessitate subueniendum 135 est, ne natura deficiat, utputa ne famem aut sitem aut aliquod huiusmodi dispendium paterentur.” Greci autem paciuntur dispendium famis et belli; igitur subueniendum nunc est eis. Et quod ista subuentio non sit ad fomentum culpe satis patet ex hoc, quod non subuenimus nisi in tempore tribulationis et necessitatis — tale enim tempus non consuevit peccata nutrire sed extinguere — nec subuenimus ut in peccato permaneant, sed ne Teucris inpugnanti- 140 bus pereant. Et Augustinus, xxiii, qu. iii: “Petere,” inquit, “uel prestare in tribulatione subsidium, ut uoluptuose quis in crimine uiuat, dampnabile est. Petere uel prestare [ad] solatium, ut malis delinquendi facultas adimatur, ut ecclesia pacem adipiscatur, ut aliquis iust-

112–114 s. Gregorius Magnus, *Reg. epist.* 2, ep. 2 = CCSL 140: 91 117–121 s. Augustinus, *De baptismo* 4.14.21 = PL 43: 167 127 Lu. 6:31 128–130 s. Chrysostomus, *Ad populum Antiochenum homiliae*, hom. 13, ed. impr. Basileae 1530, 4: 401 130–131 s. Thomas Aquinas, *S. T.* 2a 2e, qu. 25, art. 6 = ed. cit., 3: 255 132–137 *ibid.*, qu. 31, art. 2 141–144 Gratianus, 2.23.3.1 = ed. cit., col. 896

107 tum] tamen MS 111 Naxine MS 113 eius MS 125 credere MS 136 ne *alt.*] si MS 141 in quid MS

orum utilitate seruetur, utile est et honestum; dissimulare uero <est> grauissimum.” Cum igitur ex isto auxilio, si prestetur Grecis, hoc sequi possint, iuuandi uidentur. Et beatus Gregorius, xxiii qu. <iv, *Cum in lege*>: “Cum in lege scriptum sit, ‘diligas amicum tuum et odio habebis inimicum tuum’, accepta tunc licentia iustis fuerat ut Dei suosque aduersarios quanta possent, uirtute comprimerentur eosque iure gladii ferirent. Quod in Nouo procul dubio Testamento compescitur, cum per semetipsam Veritas predicat, dicens, ‘diligite inimicos uestros’.” Cum igitur Greci in necessitate sint extrema, uideretur quod Christiani obligentur quilibet secundum gradum suum subuenire. Quod secus esset si non esset necessitasurgens et extrema. Meminerit quilibet Christianus mansuetudinis Dauid, qui suis inimicis et persecutoribus in persecutionis actu parcebat, ut patet de Saul, quem conclusit bis Dominus /9rb/ in manibus Dauid, cui non solum pepercit, sed mortuum luxit et uindicauit. Et non consilio suo Absalon persecutionem pateretur; magis indignatus est contra eum qui pro eo facere uindictam proponebat, quam contra persecutorem suum; etiam uictor petentibus ueniam non negabat. Igitur et Christiani indulgere debent Grecos qui, etsi forte odio nos habeant, non tamen <nos> persecuntur et in ciuitate sua cum pace nostros recipient et saltem maiores eorum misericordiam petunt aliique complures. Quid enim magis inimicorum corda confringere potest faciesque consuadere quam ut ab eis cogantur?

Preterea Cyrillus super Lucam dicit: “Decet enim eum qui est pius obliuisci malorum ut et ea quibus caros amicos iuamur, persequentibus conferamur.” Et Basilius super illo, ‘Diligite inimicos uestros, benefacite,’ etc.: “Quia homo ex corpore consistit et anima, secundum animam quidem benefaciamus, huiusmodi arguentes et comonentes et eos omnimode ad conuersionem manucentes; secundum corpus autem benefaciamus eis in necessariis uicui.” Et Cyrillus super eodem, ‘Benefacite,’ etc., dicit: “Non modo decet <ut> non odio habeas, sed diligas. Neque simpliciter mandauit diligere, sed etiam benefacere.” Ergo non sufficit Grecos odio non habere, sed eos diligere eosque corrigere et corporalibus beneficiis adiuuare debemus.

Preterea non debemus de Grecis uindictam sumere. Dicit enim, Leuitici xix: “Non queras ultionem nec memor eris iniurie ciuium tuorum.” Et Saluator noster, Matt. v, dicit: “Si quis te percusserit,” etc. Cyrillus quoque: “Nam et medici cum calce feriuntur ab infirmis, tamen maxime misereantur eis et adtendunt ad eorum remedia. Tu quoque similem habeas coniunctionem erga persequentes ipsum. Namque sunt qui precipue infirmitatem, nec prius desistamus quam totam amaritudinem euomuerint. Tunc uberes gratias agent tibi et ipse Deus te coronabit, eo quod fratrem tuum a pessima egritudine liberabis.” Et Glossa dicit ibidem: “Docuit Dominus iniuriam inferenti non esse resistendum, sed ad plura perferenda paratum esse. Nunc autem ulterius docet iniuriam inferenti inpendendum etiam caritatis affectum simul et effectum.” Et si diceretur quod ista sunt uera de inimicis priuatis et singulorum et non de inimicis ecclesiae qualis est scisma Grecorum, respondet Glossa super Matheum, ‘Diligite inimicos uestros,’ etc.: “Contra ecclesiam pugnatur tribus modis: odio, uerbis et cruciatu corporis; ecclesia econtra diligit, benefacit et orat: hoc est nouum mandatum. Hoc de filiis ire facit filios Dei, unde sequitur quod sitis filii Patris nostri.” Ecce quomodo omnibus malis illatis /9va/ ecclesia ipsa respondere debet cum bonis. Aliter enim nulla

146–150 *ibid.*, 2.23.4.16 = ed. cit., col. 904 152–157 2 Sam. 18 161–162 s. Cyrillus Alexandrinus, *Comm. in Luc.* 5.31 (199) = PG 72: 598 162–166 pseudo-Basilii Caesariensis, *Regula monachorum*, ca. 82: De inimicis diligendis, itp. Rufino = ed. impr. Coloniae 1531, p. 368 170–171 Leuit. 19:18 172 Matt. 5:39 177–179 *Glossa ordinaria*, ad loc. = PL 114: 97 181–183 *ibid.*

148 gladio fruerent MS 149 –ipsas MS 155 indignatus est MS 156 persecutionem MS 164 eos et MS
166 modo] aut MS 174 coniecturam ergo MS ipsi MS 177 inferendam MS 183 quod] ut ed.

esset differentia inter Christianos <et> ethnicos, inter filios Dei et peccatores. Sicut Domi- 185
 nus ait: “Si diligitis eos qu<i u>os diligunt, quomodo mercedem habebitis?” et quasi dicat:
 “Nullam.” Et Luce vi, “Et si benefacitis hiis qui uobis bene faciunt, quae uobis erit gratia?”
 etc., “siquidem et peccatores hoc faciunt.” Nisi enim dimiseritis debitoribus uestris, non di-
 mittetur et uobis, Matt. vi: “Si enim dimiseritis hominibus peccata eorum, dimittet et uobis
 Pater celestis peccata uestra. Si autem non dimiseritis,” etc. “Et dimitte nobis debita nostra, 190
 sicut et nos,” <etc.> ubi Crisostimus dicit: “Cum qua ergo spe orat qui inimicitiam seruat
 aduersus alterum, a quo forsitan lesus est? Sicut enim ipse orans mentitur — dicit enim
 ‘remitto’ et non remittit — sic et a Deo petit indulgentiam et non illi indulgetur. Sed multi
 nolentes dare ueniam peccatoribus in se, fugiant istam orationem orare. Stulti sunt, primo,
 quoniam qui non sic orat, ut docuit Christus, non tum Christi discipulus; secundo, quia 195
 Pater non libenter <ex>audit orationem quam Filius non dictauit. Cognoscit enim Pater
 Filii sui sensus, et uerba non suscipit que usurpatio humana excogitauit sed que sapientia
 Christi exposuit.”

Quam ob rem uidetur et Grecis debitoribus nostris parcendum et pro posse subuenien-
 dum et Saluatorem nostrum imitari, qui solem suum facit oriri super bonos et malos et pluit, 200
 etc. Dicit Augustinus super Ioannem, quia superius dixit: “hoc est preceptum meum, ut
 diligatis inuicem sicut dilexi uos.” Fit ex hoc consequens quod idem Ioannes in epistola sua
 dicit et, quemadmodum Christus pro nobis animam suam posuit, sic et nos debemus animas
 pro fratribus ponere. Hoc martires ardenti dilectione fecerunt.” Et maxime peccatoribus
 obstinatis compaciendum est, sicut enim Samuel lugebat Saulem quem sciebat a domino 205
 reprobatum, i Regum xv. Et Saluator noster contra nolentes peccatoribus parcere parabolam
 de seruo nequam posuit, <cui> Dominus multa dimiserat et, cum ipse nollet conseruo di-
 mittere, tormentis adhibitis quod dimiserat repetiit, Matt. xviii. Et profecto plurimum mouere
 debet ad compaciendum in necessitate positus quod in die iudicii disceptatio fiet de operibus
 misericordie exhibitis et non exhibitis egentibus, Matt. xxv. Ponamus ergo non animas 210
 <modo> nostras pro Grecis sicut tenemur, sed temporalia bona et alia comittentur, ut sic
 faciamus licet ii in scismati heretica sint et ingrati.

Quinto loco Seneca, moralis grauis auctoritas, accedit, qui in Epistola lxxxii ad Lucillum
 putat etiam ingratis beneficium dandum, sic inquit: “Si periculum ingratitude /9vb/
 uitare uolueritis, non dabis beneficia: ita ne apud ingratum pereant, apud te peribunt. Non 215
 respondeant potius quam non dentur: et post malam segetem serendum est. Sepe quicquid
 perierat assidua infelicis soli sterilitate, unius anni restituit ubertas. Nemo habet tam certam
 in beneficiis manu<m> ut non sepe fallatur: aberrent ut aliquando hereant, sicut post nau-
 fragium maria temptantur.” Idem etiam in quarto De beneficiis tria esse tempora concludit
 quibus ingratis et malis beneficium conferendum: primum cum illud beneficium ad gratos 220
 quoque fit, tibi sit peruenturum, ut satius sit prodesse etiam malis propter bonos quam bonis
 deesse propter malos. — Quod in auxilio Grecis prestando haud dubie eueniet ut in reti-
 nenda Constantinopoli sint etiam retinenda Christianorum loca uicina. — Secundum tem-
 pus est, cum maior<um> suorum ea fuerint merita eaque laus ut posteriores, quantumuis

186 Matt. 5:46 187–188 Lu. 6:33 189–191 Matt. 6:14 191–198 pseudo-Chrysostomus, *Opus imperfectum in*
Euang. Matt., hom. 14 = PG 56: 714 200 Matt. 5:45 201–204 s. Augustinus, *In Ioh. euang. tract.* 84.1 = PL 35:
 1846–47 206 1 Sam. 14 208 Matt. 18:23–35 210 Matt. 25:31–4 214–219 Seneca, *Ep. mor.* 11.2 (81), c. 3
 219–222 Seneca, *De ben.* 4.28.1 223–225 *ibid.*, 4.30.1

185 inter *alt.*] et MS 187 quae] quid MS gratis MS 191 erat MS 194 uolentes MS 195 sic non MS
 197 sed] si MS 208 reperis MS plurium MS 211 alii MS 217 restituat MS ubertas] liberta MS
 220 ingrate et male MS 221 satis sit prodesset MS 224 posteriorum MS

mali, beneficiis prosequendi uideantur. — Ut certe prosequendi sunt Greci, quorum ma- 225
iores doctrina, integritate et omni genere laudis ecclesiam Dei illustrarunt. — Tertium tem-
pus est cum non quid meritum ingrati flagitet, sed quid humanitas exigit attendimus, ut
non homini sed humanitati dandum putemus. Quo etiam in loco addit Seneca beneficium
propter se esse expetendum et non propter aliud, ut clare appareat; eius collatione tantum
contentari nos non debere, nec pericula, labores aggrauationesque rancorum nostrorum 230
uitandas, dum eos hiis incomodis liberemus. Aristoteles quoque, viii Ethicorum, ingrato ben-
efitium dandum affirmat cum correctionis future signum aliquod apparebat. Cuiusmodi
multa in Grecis sepe ostendunt<ur>. Salustius quoque magne laudi Romanis ascribit quod
ingratis sepius ultro ignouerunt, beneficia insuper conferendo, “Bello,” inquit,
“Macedonico quod cum rege Perse gessimus, Rhodiorum ciuitas, magna atque magnifica, 235
quae populi Romani opibus creuerat, infida atque aduersa nobis fuit; sed postquam bello
confecto <de> Rhodiis consultum est, maiores nostri, ne quis diuitiarum magis quam ini-
iurie causa bellum inceptum diceret, inpunitos eos dimisere. Item, bellis Punicis omnibus
cum sepe Carthaginenses <et> in pace et per inducias multa nepharia facinora fecissent,
numquam ipsi per occasionem talia fecerunt, magis quid se dignum foret quam quid in illos 240
iure fieri posset quereba<n>t.” Valerius insuper Maximus, loco quarto, capitulo secundo,
ubi agit de remissione inimicitarum et odii, “Spetiosius,” inquit, “multo est cum iniuriarum
beneficiis uincuntur quam cum mutui odii per/10ra/tinacia pensantur.” Et Demosthenes
etiam in oratione ante Alexandrum habita in tris laudibus hoc beneficiorum et clementie
opus extollit: “Per aliud,” inquit, “accedere propius ad Deum non potes quam ut 245
salutem conferas hominibus, uel dando si eguerint uel parcendo si deliquerint uel in-
dulgento si supplicauerint. Cum enim a Deo in omni munere [et unitate] uincamur, sola
clementia e<s>t quae nos ei reddit equales.” Quibus omnibus apparet pietatis esse et hu-
manitatis et summe clementie Grecis miserrime laborantibus opem afferre.

Urgere insuper potissimum uidetur Christianos quod Greci auxilium petunt maxi- 250
meque imperator qui hoc petit et patriarcha qui huc ad summum pontificem se contulit
impetrandi auxilii causa. Dicit enim Augustinus in Encheridion: “Si homo qui nondum ita
profecit ut iam diligat inimicum, tamen quando rogatur ab homine qui peccauit in eum ut
ei dimittat, <dimittit> ex corde.” Et infra sequitur: “Quisquis autem roganti peccati sui
ueniam et penitenti non ex corde dimittit, nullo modo extimet a domino suo peccata dimitti, 255
quoniam mentiri Veritas non potest que dixit: ‘Si cum dimiseritis hominibus peccata eorum,
dimittet et uobis Pater uester celestis delicta uestra. Si autem non dimiseritis hominibus, nec
Pater uester dimittet peccata uestra.’ Ad tam magnum tonitruum qui non expergiscitur,
non dormit sed mortuus est.” Sequitur ergo quod in imperfectis necessarium est dimittere
rogantibus, perfectis uero etiam non rogantibus. Grecis ergo et petentibus et rogantibus a 260
Christianis uidetur subueniendum; Christiani enim actus dilectio proximorum est. Ioh. xiii:
“in hoc cognoscent omnes quod discipuli mei estis, si dilectionem <ad> inuicem habueritis.”
Dilectio ergo proximorum distinguit Christi discipulum a non discipulo.

226–231 *ibid.*, 4.27.3 231 Aristoteles, *Eth. Nic.* 9.3.3, 1165b 20 234–241 Sallustius, *Cat.* 51.5 242–243 Valerius
Maximus 4.2.4, ed. Kempf, 330 245–248 pseudo-Demosthenes, *Orat. in Alex.* = *Historiae Alexandri continuatio mediaeualis*,
ed. E. M. Smits, *Viator* 18 (1987): 111 252–259 s. Augustinus, *Enchirid.* 19.73–74 = CCSL 46: 89 256–258 Matt. 6:14
262 Jo. 13:35

229–230 tamen contentat MS non] esse MS ranconum sic MS nostrarum MS 232 dando MS
236 quam MS atque] cum MS 238 bellis Punicis] bestis punitis sic MS 240 fecere ed. quid alt.] quod MS
242 Specio suis MS iniurio MS 247 adeo MS uincantur aliter uincamur MS 253 inimicum] minimum MS
255 dominus sua MS 256 quoniam] quomodo MS

Preterea conuenit adiuuare Grecos ex eorum conditione comparata ad conditionem Teucrorum. Cum enim duo mala imminet, maius est euitandum, ut beatus Gregorius dicit, 265
xxiii dist., *Nerui testiculorum*. Ex communi enim conditione Greci non sunt nobis ita hostiliter infesti sicut Teucri. Dicitur enim quod Greci nos odio habent; Teucri uero nos odio habent et hostiliter insecuntur, tum ex eorum conditione, tum ob sectam Machometicam quam profitentur, quoniam manu armata cogit omnes ad suum abhominabilem cultum. Unde propter hanc differentiam Alexander papa omnibus episcopis Hispanie scribens dicit, xxiii, qu. viii, 270
Dispar: “Dispar nimirum est Iudeorum et Sarracenorum causa. In illos enim qui Christianos persecuntur <et> ex urbibus et propriis sedibus pellunt iuste pugnatur; hii ubique seruire parati sunt.” Ergo debemus Grecos iuuare et tollerare ne in seruitutem Teucrorum redigantur. Timendum enim ualde est, ut ab hiis asseritur, qui partium illarum noticiam habent, quod capta Constantinopoli in finitimis regionibus ma/10rb/gnum exsequeretur excidium 275
Christianorum et fidei. Ideoque melius est Grecos tollerare, sicut meretrices ecclesia tollerat, propter maiora mala uitanda. Et hec cum correctione, ad primum dubium sint dicta, licet multa alia melius dici possent.

[1c] <Responsiones ad argumenta superius sub [1a] illata.>

Ad primum uero argumentum et rationes in contrarium factas, cum dicitur quod Greci scismatici, heretici, etc., dicendum quod, licet inter eos sint multi tales, nihilominus [tamen] 280
sunt et plures optimi uiri, propter quos subueniendum est omnibus, ut ostensum est. Quantum ad naturam, et mali corripiantur et emendentur a culpa ut sic ad domum patri<s> familias compellantur introire. Vel aliter, ut dicit sanctus Thomas, 2a 2e, qu. xxxi, art. ii, in solutione ultimi argumenti: “Excommunicatis et reipublice hostibus in casu necessitatis, ne fame uel siti uel alio periculo natura deficiat, succurrendum est ipsis.” 285

Ad secundum, cum dicitur quod Christum non legimus absoluisse mortuos in errore, dicendum quod tex<tus> ille est xxiii qu. ii, *Legatur*; probat quod mortuos in peccato mortali absolvere ecclesia non potest: ‘mortuos tuos’, scilicet morte corporali cum essent in peccato mortali. Atque ita non est ad propositum.

Ad tertium, quod ingratissimis uiris non sunt prestanda beneficia et quod ingratus 290
exsiccat fontem pietatis, etc., dicendum quod ingrati, quantum est de se, exsiccant sibi fontem misericordie et rorem pietatis. Fons autem misericordie in nobis desiccari non debet propter eorum ingratitudinem, quia nos propter Deum agimus que agimus, si tamen ea recte agimus, non propter gratiarum actiones humanas. Nam et ethnici hoc faciunt et peccatores, Matt. v. Deus enim benignus est super ingratos et malos et nos debemus con- 295
formare Deo per hoc quod ibi dicitur.

Ad quartum, cum dicitur quod Greci uidentur uelle semper in sua perfidia permanere, dicendum quod licet multi uideantur esse tales, scimus tamen et cognouimus quod non omnes fuerunt nec sunt perfidi, sed sunt multi insignes et religiosi uiri, ut cardinales, epis- 300
copi, abbates alique inferioris gradus. Quid autem acturi sint nescimus nec iudicare de futuris debemus, et ita auctoritas illa Gregorii non est ad propositum, quia loquitur contra illam rationem qua dicebant Origeniste non esse futuras penas eternas pro peccato temporali, et auctoritas illa non potest intelligi nisi de illis qui in peccato mortali moriuntur. De uiuentibus autem nescimus quid paritura sit futura dies, quia forte desinent peccare.

265–266 Gratianus, 1.23.2 = ed. cit., col. 32 271–273 ibid., 2.23.8.11 = ed. cit., col. 955 284–285 s. Thomas
Aquinas, S. T. 2a 2e, qu. 31, art. 2 = ed. cit., 3: 309 287 Gratianus, 2.24.2.2 = ed. cit., col. 984 295 Matt. 5:47

267 Grecorum MS 268 tum *alt.*] tamen MS 271 nimium MS 282 domum] communem MS 285 situ MS
302 organiste MS; cf. s. *Gregorius Magnus*, Mor. 34.19.38

Ad quintum, quod ad uirtutem pertinet sumere uindictam de malis, etc., dicendum 305
 /10va/ quod uindicantis animus potest in duo ferri, scilicet in malum peccantis, ita ut ibi
 quiescat, et sic est odium ad peccatum, quasi delectetur in malo aliorum, quod est contra
 caritatem. Unde Apostolus, ad Romanos xii: "Noli uinci a malo sed uince in bono malum."
 Vel fertur animus uindicantis in aliquod bonum, utputa in emendationem uel cohibitionem
 peccatoris a malis propter aliorum quietem et iustitie complementum. Et hoc modo uindi- 310
 catio uirtus est, sed istud non habet locum in proposito, quia maius dedecus et iactura sequi-
 tur ex interitu Grecorum per Teucros quam ex eorum uita. Nec hoc modo seruaretur ordo
 iustitie cum [cum] oportet simul bonos perire cum malis. Nec Teucris mouentur zelo iustitie
 super malos Grecos, sed spiritu dyabolico contra Christum et legem eius. Ita quod non est
 uirtus quod ecclesia permittit suos subditos puniri per infideles in contemptum nominis 315
 Christiani, quoniam ex hoc eorum emendatio non sequitur nec ad Dei gloriam nec <ad>
 fidei exaltationem, sed omnia in contrarium sequuntur.

Ad sextum, cum dicitur in capitulo *Est iniusta*, xxiii, qu, iiii, "Si quis latronem," quod Greci
 semper uidentur contra Latinos aspirari, dicendum quod Greci non hostiliter insidiantur
 Latinis, sed si aliqui insidiantur, sunt puniendi per ecclesie principem, non relinquendi in- 320
 fidelibus. Et ita exemplum Ambrosii non est simile, quia loquitur de latrone qui non pro-
 ponit dimittere latrocinium, et etiam loquitur de iudice habente auctoritatem. Sed inter
 Grecos multi sunt catholici et forte erunt plures [per] Teucrique nullam habent auctoritatem
 in eis.

[2a] <Ad alterum dubium: argumenta pro et contra.>

Utrum Grecis negligentibus et non petentibus auxilium, etc., Christiani teneantur etc. 325
 Hoc maxime uideretur possibile quia indurati in sua malitia nollent <iuuari>, eligentes
 potius mori in perfidia quam ecclesie Romane obedire. Sed tali<bu>s non est auxilium
 prestandum, cum sibi ponunt omni pietati obicem et insanibiles se reddant.

Preterea subueniendum est Grecis, ne gens pereat Grecorum aut ne pereat ciuitas
 eorum. <Et uidetur quod non.> Primum quia, si quis potest illos capere, deberet eos 330
 tanquam incorrigibiles et hereticos punire. Et secundum quia per malos ciues solent ciuitates
 dari in manum odientium et in excidium sicut de ciuitatibus Sodomorum et Iudeorum.
 Preter<e>a ciuitas non dicitur bona uel mala nisi propter merita uel demerita ciuium, sed
 ciues isti pessimi sunt, ergo de ciuitate non est curandum.

Sed contrarium est quod, sicut patet <ex> ii Machabeorum iii, cum rex Anthiochus ab 335
 Eliodoro peteret quis esset aptus ad oppugnandu<m> Iherusalem, respondit ille: "si quem
 habes hostem aut regni tui insidiatorem, mitte illuc et flagellatum eum re/10vb/ cipies, si
 tamen euaserit: eo quod in loco uere Dei sit quedam uirtus. Nam et ipse qui habet in celis
 habitationem, uisitor et adiutor est loci illius, et uenientes ad malefaciendum perdit et
 percutit." Ergo in ciuitatis loco potest esse quedam Dei uirtus sine merito populi, propter 340
 quam sit illi succurrendum. Et sic in materia presenti potest haberi respectus et ad Grecos
 et ad ciuitatem eorum.

Quantum ad Grecos, quid dicendum sit patet ex dictis Augustini superius. Nam si Greci
 non essent iuditio intelligentium in extrema necessitate constituti, non esset ex neces-
 sitate precepti eis subueniendum, sed esset consilium quod ad perfectos pertinet, non 345
 obligans comunitatem. Sed posito casu extreme necessitatis omnes sunt obligati. Unde, si

308 Rom. 12:21 318 cf. linn. 68–70 335 2 Machab. 3:38–39 343 cf. lin. 252 supra

313 Nec] Hec MS 316 nec] in MS 319 aspiciari sic MS 330 eorum] noui MS; cf. lin. 342 331 Et] Nec MS

Greci petunt, subueniendum est ut dictum est, et si non potest propter illorum duritiem aut perfidiam adhuc sperare conuersiones illorum. Vel aliquem eorum subuenire debemus, non aspicientes ad eius culpam sed ad eius naturam, ut cum bono eius communicamus maliciam et cor inpenitens [etc.]. Sicut dicit beatus Augustinus, xxiii, qu. iiii, *Ipsa pietas*, ubi dicit quod 350
existentes in periculo ruiture domus nec inde exire uolentes, nos inuitos debemus eos liberare si possumus, et si alter eorum uel plures, si eos uolumus liberare, necare se uolunt, unus uero tantum nec se necare nec tamen inde uult exire sed ibi uult mori, si illum ui capere possumus, tenemur. Cum igitur maiores Grecorum petant auxilium et cupiant liberari, licet forte alii nolint, etiam nolentes liberare debemus. 355

Preterea ad ciuitatem debemus habere respectum. Ciuitas quippe aliquando sancta uel non sancta dicitur propter homines. Sed hoc dupliciter, quia aut propter presentes aut propter preteritos. Et dato quod propter presentes non esset eis subueniendum, tamen propter preteritos esset id illis beneficium conferendum, qui doctrina, religione et summa integritate claruerunt. Secundo, propter multa corpora sanctorum que ibi recondita sunt. Tertio, propter ecclesias et uasa sacra que ibidem sunt. Quarto, propter fundatoris memoriam et reuerentiam. Cum igitur in Constantinopoli Christus colatur celeberrimaque in ea templa sint multa pluraque sanctorum corpora, multa ornamenta ad cultum Christianum dicata, enitendum est ne illa ciuitas pereat. Multo enim facilius possit defendi quam perdita recuperari. Est autem illa ciuitas una sensualis memoria et testimonium indicans deuotionem fidei 365
et feruorem magni Constantini quem habet in Christi et ecclesiae sui honorem. Cessit enim ecclesiae [in] principatu<m> Romani im<perii quem> beato Siluestro dedit uel restituit, <et> indignum se reputans Christi uicario cohabitare, Orientem petiit, de quo beatus Gregorius in Regesto scribens ad Philibertum regem Anglorum: “Constantinus quidem piissimus imperator Romanam rem publicam a peruersis idolorum cultibus reuocans, omnipotenti Domino nostro Ihesu Christo secum subdidit seque cum subiectis populis tota ad Deum mente conuertit. Unde factum /I Ira/ est ut antiquorum principum nomen suis uir ille laudibus uinceret, et tanto in opinione predecessores suos, quanto et in <bono> opere superaret.” Et, ni fallor, plurimum obligatur populus Christianus et precipue ecclesia Romana prefato Constantino, maximeque propter eius memoriam omnibus uiribus est laborandum 375
ne ciuitas sua, secunda Romana habitatio illius principis qui Romanam ecclesiam plurimum illustrauit, cedat<ur> in habitationem generis infidelis et Christiano nomini infensi. Et si propter demerita Grecorum cetera ciuitates Grece sint perditae, hec tamen propter merita Constantini seruanda, et si Greci mali sunt, fiat de illa ciuitate quod dominus fecit de uinea sua, qui malos agricolas male perdidit et aliis locauit qui redderent fructum in tempore. 380

[2b] *Quantum ad primum argumentum.* <Responsiones ad argumenta iam illata, scilicet Graecis auxilium dari non debere.>

In oppositum, cum dicitur si non peterent, hoc maxime esset quia essent indurati, etc., dicendum est quod ista perplexitas cessat cum ipsi petant, et si non peterent, adhuc subueniendum esset eis, saltem propter ciuitatem ut dictum est, etc.

Ad secundum argumentum, dicendum quod subueniendum est Grecis et propter eos et 385

349–350 Ro. 2:5 350 Gratianus, 2.23.4.24 = ed. cit., col. 909 369–374 s. Gregorius Magnus, *Reg. epist.* 11, ep. 37 = CCSL 140A: 929

348 sperantes MS alicuis MS 349 cum] in MS 353 tantum] tamen MS uterque uult] nec MS
363 euitendum MS 365 testimonium] libertorum MS; cf. lin. 714 366 sui] mallem eius 369 recte Adilbertum
370 a] aut MS 371 Deum] eum ed. 375 eius] eorum MS 380 qui primum] quia MS malos] malas MS

propter ciuitatem et propter alios Christianos et propter nos, ut dictum est. Et si caperent ab ecclesia, bonos seruarent et malos punirent et recte actum esset. Quod uero dicitur, quod propter malos ciues ciuitates patiuntur excidium, uerum est quando nullus alius respectus habetur. Vel dicendum quod iuditia hominum non deberet equari iuditio Dei: scimus quod nos esse pios erga malos optimum est, quos tamen iudex uniuersalis sine misericordia iudicabit, quia iudicium sine misericordia fiet illi qui non fecit misericordiam. Sic igitur oculo Deus suo iuditio ciuitatem illam perdere uelit non obstantibus omnibus rationibus adductis. “Congaudendum esset,” ut inquit Gregorius; “Iusticie iudicis congaudendum et condolendum miserie pereuntis.” Nos tamen promptiores esse ad parcendum et ad absolendum quam ad condemnandum debemus, et potissime ubi magne pietatis rationes apparent, ut in presenti.

Ad tertium patet responsio ex superioribus.

[3] *Ad tertium dubium, uidelicet:*

Utrum summus pontifex pre ceteris principibus et regibus Christianis teneatur, etc. Reiectis que dici in contrarium possent, uidetur quod sic; debet enim esse precipua et singularis cura summi pontificis ad orbem uniuersum, non ad aliquas particulares prouintias uel regna. Misit enim Saluator noster apostolos suos in uniuersum, Marci ultimo; “In omnem terram exiuit sonus eorum”, xix dist. Ita Dominicus, De electione, can. *Fundamenta*, Libro Sexto: nimis confortatus est principatus eorum. Constituti sunt principes super omnem terram, lxviii dist. Quorum uices papa in hereditate succedit /11rb/ illis. “Ipse namque est,” ut dicit Bernardus, “princeps episcoporum, heres apostolorum, primatu Abel, gubernatu Noe, patriarchatu Abraham, dignitate Aaron, auctoritate Moyses, iudicatu Samuel, potestate Petrus, unctione Christus, cui omnes oues credite sunt. Habent singuli singulos assignatos greges; tibi uniuersi crediti sunt; non modo ouium sed et pastorum [omnium] tu unus omnium pastor.” “Agnosce hereditatem tuam in cruce Christi, in laboribus plurimis. Felix qui dicere potuit: ‘plus [pepuli] omnibus laboraui.’ Si labor terret, merces inuitet. Unusquisque enim secundum laborem recipiet mercedem.” Sic Dominus docuit pastorem bonum diligere populum suum et animam suam ponere pro ouibus suis. Sic et Apostolus dicebat: “Ego libentissime inpendam et superimpendar pro animabus uestris,” ii Ad Chorotheos xii. Ad pastorem namque pertinet habere perfectionem caritatis, et in hoc differt status religionis a statu episcoporum. Presit papa ut prouideat, ut consulat, ut seruiat; presit ut prosit: viii, qu. i, *Qui episcopatum*. “Presit ut fidelis seruus et prudens quem constituit dominus super familiam suam. Ad quid igitur? Ut det illis escam in tempore opportuno. Nihil plus accepit a magnis apostolis. <Sic> Paulus <dicit quod> sapientibus et insipientibus debitor est. Considerat ut qui non sapiunt, sapiant, et qui <dis>sapiunt, resipiscant. At nullum genus insipientie infidelitate insipientius. Ergo infidelibus debitor est: Iudeis, Grecis et Gentilibus. Interest proinde dare operam quam possit ut increduli conuertantur ad fidem. Conuersi non auertantur, auersi reuertantur: porro [peruersi ad ueritatem reuertantur,] peruersi ordi-

391 Jac. 2:13 393–394 s. Gregorius Magnus, *Mor.* 22.11 402 Marc. 16:15 403 Gratianus, 1.19.7 = ed. cit., col. 62 403–404 Bonifacius VIII, *Liber Sextus* 1.6.17, ed. Pithoei, 2: 291–92 405 Gratianus, 1.68.6 = ed. cit., col. 256 405–410 s. Bernardus Claraualensis, *De consid.* 2.8.15, ed. Mabillon, col. 1032 410–412 ibid., 2.6.12, ed. Mabillon, cols. 1028–29 411 1 Cor. 15:10 412–413 Joh. 10:15 413–414 2 Cor. 12:15 416–417 Gratianus, 2.8.1.11 = ed. cit., col. 594 417–430 s. Bernardus Claraualensis, *De consid.* 3.1.2–4, ed. cit., cols. 1040–42 419–420 Ro. 1:14

390 erga *ex corr. man. alt.*: apud *man. prima* 391 iudiciis MS 396 in] tamen MS 408 Habeat MS 411 tenet MS 413 ponat MS 414 libenter MS impendar MS uestris *Vulg.*] patris MS 416 ut *alt.*] et MS 419 apostolus MS Consideret MS 420 resipiscant] non dissapiant MS Ac MS 421 insipientius] insipienti est MS 422 prouide MS 423 auertantur] anectantur MS conuertantur MS

nentur ad rectitudinem, subuersi ad ueritatem reuocentur. Non omnino ab hoc insipientium
 genere pessimo tibi dissimulandum est. Dico autem hereticos scismaticosque: nam hii sunt 425
 subuersi et subuersores. Erunt inquam maxime tuo studio aut corrigendi ne pereant aut ne
 perimant coercendi. Ego addo et de pertinacia: qui nobiscum sunt et non sunt, iuncti fide,
 pace diuisi, quamquam et in fide ipsa claudicauerint a semitis rectis. Tu, plage huic reme-
 dium prouidere. Quid defidimus posse reuerti in oues cum quibus uerti in lupos potue-
 runt?” Hec Bernardus. Aggrediatur ergo summus pontifex forti et magno animo, “cui magno 430
 nihil est magnum,” ut Seneca <inquit>, hanc piam et miseram Grecorum, immo et com-
 unem Christianorum causam, tamquam pius pater et pietatem habens, liberans eos qui du-
 cuntur ad mortem. Ita enim dicitur, Prouerbiorum xxiii: “Erue eos qui ducuntur ad mor-
 tem et qui trahuntur ad interitum liberare non cesses. Si dixeris, uires non suppetunt; qui
 inspector est cordis ipse intelliget, et seruatorem anime tue nil fallit. Reddetque homini iuxta 435
 opera sua.” Et Apostolus Paulus, i Ad Chorintheos iii: “Itaque neque qui plantat est aliquid
 neque qui rigat, sed qui incrementum dat, Deus. Unusquisque autem propriam mercedem
 accipiet secundum suum laborem.” Et Sapien<ti>e x: “Reddidit iustis mercedem laborum
 suorum.” /11va/ Si quis enim positus in angustia, quia uidet rerum difficultatem et accidia
 et desperatione opprimitur, minuitur potentia sua. Sic enim dicitur, Prouerbiorum xxiii: “Si 440
 desperaueris lassus in die angustie, <im>minuetur fortitudo tua.”

Quod autem pontifex potestatem habeat manifestum est. Dicit enim Innocentius: Deus
 a principio creauit celum et terram et omnia que in eis sunt, angelicam et humanam natu-
 ram, spiritualia et temporalia, ipsamque per se ipsum textit sicut factor, suam rem gubernat,
 et homini quem creauit precepta dedit et transgredienti penam imposuit, Genesis ii. Ex 445
 omnium ligno ipsis etiam peccantibus penam imposuit per se ipsum, Ade et Eue, Genesis
 iii; ibi mulieri quoque dixit, etc., et ibi Ade uero dixit, <etc.> Qualiter autem per se ipsum
 Cain puniuerit et Enoch et quosdam alios habetur, Genesis iiii, et sic recto modo per se
 ipsum usque ad Noe. Ex tempore Noe cepit Deus creaturas suas regere per ministros, quo-
 rum primus fuit Noe; de quo, quod fuerat rector populi, apparet quia dedit sibi gubernatio- 450
 nem arche, per quam ecclesia significatur, Genesis v et vi. Item, quia etiam Noe et filiis
 Dominus dedit rectoriam et legem, Genesis viii, ubi etiam, licet de Noe non legatur sacerdo-
 tem fuisse, sacerdotis tamen offitium exercuit statim post egressum arche, quando populis
 legem daret, Genesis ix: ibi edificauit aram Noe, quod <est> officium sacerdotis. Similiter
 Abel et Kain fecerunt primo; in hec autem uicaria successerunt iudices, patriarche, reges et 455
 sacerdotes et alii qui pro tempore fuerunt in regimine populi Iudeorum, et sic durauit usque
 ad Christum, qui est et fuit naturalis Dominus et rex noster, de quo in Psalmo: “Deus iudit-
 ium tuum regi,” etc. Isaie: “Omnis rex noster”. Et ipse Iesus Christus uicarium constituit
 suum Petrum et successores suos quando ei dedit clauis regni celorum, et quando dixit ei:
 “Pasce oues meas.” Et quamuis in multos distincta sunt offitia et regimina mundi, 460
 tamen quandocumque necesse est ad papam recurrendum, hoc supposito, siue sit necessitas
 iuris, quia iudex dubius est, quando sententiam ferre debent Dei iure; uel necessitas facti,
 quia alius non est superior, *Qui filii sint legitimi*, can. *Peruenerabilem*. Iurisdictio enim est de
 genere promissorum, et sancta et iusta, *De maiori et obedientia*, can. *Solite*. Et quod in pre-

430–431 Seneca, *Ep. mor.* 1.8.5 433–436 Prou. 24:11–12 436–438 1 Cor. 3:7–8 438–439 Sap. 10:17
 440–441 Prou. 24:10 457 Ps. 71:2 458 Isa. 33 460 Jo. 21:17 463 *Epist. Innocentii III libri XI* 5.128, ed. S.
 Baluzius, impr. Parisiis 1682, 2: 674–76 464 *Collectio decretalium Innocentii III*, tit. 2, ed. Rainerus, in Baluzius, cit., 1: 549

426 ne *prim.*] ire MS 427 Graecorum *post* pertinacia *ed.* 428 -uerunt MS 430 magno] magnum MS
 431 miseriam MS 432 et *post* causam *del.* dicuntur MS 435 tue] sue MS 445 hominem MS 448 Enoch]
 Lameus MS quodam MS 451 significare MS 454 aram *man. alt.*: aaron *man. prim.* 458 tum riga MS
 462 necessitatis MS 464 et *prim.*] est MS

senti materia summus pontifex, tamquam generalis uicarius Ihesu Christi, habeat potestatem 465
super omnes fideles et infideles, latissime ponitur per doctores, *De uoto et uoti redemptione*,
can. *Quod super hiis*: concludunt enim quod, quando papa uult bellum indicare contra infi-
deles quia expelluntur fideles ab infidelibus qui egrediuntur contra eos, sicut hoc contingit
propter demerita nostra et peccata, potest dare indulgentiam pugnantibus contra eos, xxiii,
qu. viii, *Igitur*. Et causa subsistente potest illos priuare bonis suis, et causam subesse dicunt 470
si delinquant contra legem nature—sicut nunc faciunt quia faciunt aliis quod sibi nollent
fieri—et potest dominiis et terris illos priuare quos in obprobrium occupauerunt. Ponit ex-
emplum Innocentius in recuperatione Terre Sancte, quia illa terra consecrata fuit in circum-
cisione, natiuitate et /I Ivb/ morte Ihesu Christi. In ea autem non colitur Christus sed Macho-
metus; tamen, cum illa terra Christianorum censeatur per infideles in obprobrium 475
Christianorum, ideo potest pro recuperanda indicare bellum. Nam predicatione aposto-
lorum et etiam iuxta belli indictionem per Romanos hec terra fuit subiecta Christianis. Ideo
ratione imperii quod habet in illa potest papa indicare bellum. Et si forte uideretur aliquibus
quod bellum per Romanos non fuit iustum quia multi, nolentes principatum monarcharum
in papam fundari, sumunt fundamentum quod quatuor regna designata, Danielis ii, tyran- 480
nica fuerunt, quod maxime de Romano posset cedi quia ferrum ibi describitur; item, quia
regnum et potestas ecclesie est non alia a potestate quae a regno Romano, quod patet quia
lapis excisus est de monte confregit illa<m>, et adducit regnum nouum ut ibi dicitur; item,
quia non zelo uindicande mortis Christi, sed ambitione dominandi Romani moti sunt (et si
Judei iustissime passi sunt propter mortem Christi, Romani tamen iniustissime uidentur 485
egisse) et sic ecclesia non potest illo titulo gaudere. Verumtamen ea que scribuntur uerba
doctorum sunt: et etiam posset dici quod Ieronimus refert, xxviii, qu. i, quod “Romani suis
uirtutibus meruerunt imperium”; ideo in causa imperii quod habent, in illa potest papa
indicare bellum et ab eis reuocat. Et idem dicit: in omnibus terris in quibus Romani pontifi-
ces iurisdictionem habuerunt, [quia] possunt bellum indicare infidelibus qui eas occupatas 490
tenent. Nec ob predicta, quod ecclesia non uidetur habere imperium [quia illud] uerum
quoad proprietatem, sed quoad iurisdictionem et tuitionem eciam habent iurisdictionem
ubilibet. Unde concludunt papam iusta causa habere potestatem deprimendi infideles <et
recuperandi> quecumque bona et possessiones Christianorum detinent occupatas, et posset
facere precepta eis ut nullatenus Christianos molestant secundum Innocentium. Et idem 495
sequitur Hostiensis, concludens quod omnes qui occupant uel occupatas tenent terras Chris-
tianorum iuste possent auctoritate ecclesie comprimi, et multo forcius idem de hereticis et
scismaticis, de quibus in summa de hoc, in *Decretalibus Qualiter* et *De hereticis*, can. *excommuni-*
camus. Quod enim papa uel alii catholici habeant iurisdictionem in infideles, ad cuiusmodi
euidenciam premitit Hostiensis, quod in aduentu Christi omnis honor et iurdictio de iure 500
et ex causa iusta per Christum, qui summum habuit imperium, fuit ad fideles translata;
huiusmodi autem regimen commisit Dei Filius Petro et successoribus, ut plene not<um est>
De homicidio, can. *Pro humani* in Sexto; et *Qui filii sint legitimi*, can. *Peruenerabilem*. Omnibus ex
hiis concludit quod infideles subditi debent esse fidelibus, et quod papa habet supremam
potestatem tam infidelium quam fidelium. Hoc etiam confirmat Innocentius, quod papa est 505
generalis uicarius Christi, *De translatione prelatum*, can. ii. Omnes enim creature Dei sunt

466–467 *ibid.*, tit. 39 = ed. cit. 1: 597 469–470 Gratianus, 2.23.8.7 = ed. cit., col. 954 480 Dan. 2: 32–45
487–488 Gratianus, 2.28.1.14 = ed. cit., col. 1088 498 Gregorius IX, *Decretales* 5.7.13, ed. Pithoei, 240–41
498–499 *ibid.*, 5.1.24, ed. cit., 227 500–503 *Liber Sextus* 5.4.1, ed. cit., 2: 334 503 cf. lin. 463 506 Innocentius
III, *Decretalium constitutionum libri V* 1.59, ed. *Opera*, impr. Coloniae 1552, fol. CCLXVIII^v

467 inducere MS 479 uolentes MS monarchum sic MS 482 quae] et MS

per creationis actum et, licet sint infideles, tamen oues sunt, et ex hoc sequitur quod papa super omnes habet potestatem de iure, licet non de facto, ut notum *De /12ra/ electione*, can. *Significasti*; *De maiori et obedientia*, can. *Solite*; *De iudiciis*, can. *Nouit*. Per que infertur quod, si gentilis qui non habet nisi legem nature, si contra eam delinquit, potest puniri. Unde cum iudicia Dei nobis exemplaria sunt, papa eius uicarius potestatem hanc habebit. Unde concludit ex hoc quod papa omnes ydolatrās punire debet, licet infideles sint, nam naturale est unum solum Deum coli a quo omnia creata sunt, hoc est, quod punit Iudeos si faciant contra legem nature uel Veteris Testamenti. Unde Gregorius et Innocentius III mandauerunt quendam librum comburi qui uocabatur Talmuth, <quia> ex eo inducebantur hereses contra legem Veteris Testamenti. Nec ob<stat> quod nihil ad nos que foris sunt, ii., q. i. *Multi sunt*, quia uerum est specialem penam eis iniungendam cum spiritu carent. Et sic non possunt excommunicari nec etiam ad fidem compelli, unde tantummodo uoluntate inducendi sunt ad fidem, xlv dist., c. *De Iudeis*. Concludit Innocentius Hostiensi quod infideles in pace regentes et etiam infideles quos seruos tenemus non debemus compellere per bellum ut convertantur, sed solum per predicationem. Fatetur tamen quod, si possunt compelli infideles ut in terris suis predicationes admittant, fieri debet; omnis enim creatura facta est ad laudandum Deum, iuxta illud Psalmiste, “Laudate Dominum omnes gentes,” etc., et illud: “Omnis spiritus laudet Dominum.” Ideo si infideles predicationes non admittant, certum est quod peccant contra Deum et legem nature. Ideo puniri possunt in omnibus casibus in quibus licitum est aliquid mandare infidelibus; in omnibus illis licitum punire inobedientes. Dicunt Hostiensis et Innocentius quod licet compelli possint infideles ut recipiunt Christianos predicationes, infidelium tamen qui uolunt predicare Machometicam <doctrinam> non. Nam illi sunt in errore, nos autem in ueritate. Ideo interest quod ad imparia iudicentur, per nonum *De diuinatione*, cap. quinto. Dicit tamen Innocentius quod si talem priuationem iurisdictionis habeat, papa facere debet Iudeos in sua iurisdictione tollerari quantum est possibile. Preterea prelatio eius non est constituta contra bonos, sed ad coercendum malos, xxii dist., *De Constantinopolitana*. Que neque auide suscipienda nec per desidiam respuenda est: xvii, qu. i, *Nos*; viii, qu. i, *Olim* et canone sequente; xl dist., *Multi*. Debet enim in ea constitutus de subditis sollicitam curam gerere, viii, qu. i., *In scripturis*, et discordantes ad [de] concordiam reuocare, xc dist. cap. vii, *Studendum*, et in pluribus capitulis ibidem, in quibus inter alia dicitur quod clerici non debent recipere oblationes eorum quos sciunt in discordia esse. Et sicut nihil in hac uita laboriosius pastoris offitio, ita apud Deum nihil gratius, si eo modo militetur quo noster imperator iubet, ut dicit Augustinus, xl dist. *Ante omnia*. Et non solum pascere oues debet spirituali, sed etiam temporali subsidio, xxiv, qu. i, *Non afferamus*: “<Non afferamus> stateras dolosas ubi appendamus quod uolumus, quod arbitrio nostro dicentes, ‘hoc graue, hoc leue est’, sed afferamus diuinam stateram de scripturis sacris tanquam /12rb/ de thesauris dominicis, et in illa, quid sit grauius, appendamus.” Dicit namque Bernardus contra clericos: “Quotidianas expensas quotidiano recipimus scrutinio et continua dominici gregis detrimenta nescimus. De precio escarum et numero panum cum ministris quotidiana discussio est; rara admodum cum presbyteris celebratur collatio de peccatis po-

508–509 Gregorius IX, *Decretales* 1.5.4, ed. cit., 14 509 cf. lin. 464 Gregorius IX, *Decretales* 2.1.13, ed. cit., 72 519
 Gratianus, 1.45.5 = PL 187: 235 523 Ps. 116:1 523–524 Ps. 150:6 532–533 Gratianus, 1.22.4 = PL 187:125
 533–534 ibid., 2.17.2.2 = PL 187: 1060 ibid., 2.8.1.8 = PL 187: 775 ibid., 1.40.11 = PL 187: 218 535 ibid.,
 2.8.1.9 = PL 187: 775 536 ibid., 1.90.7 = PL 187: 427 539 ibid., 1.40.7 = ed. Friedberg, col. 146 = Augustinus,
Ep. 34.1.21 540–543 ibid., 2.24.1.21 = ed. cit., col. 973 544–547 s. Bernardus Claraualensis, *De consid.* 4.6.20

526 illud MS 531 tollerare MS 532 eius] enim MS 533 desideria MS 543 quis MS 544 recipiamus MS
 545 panis MS

pulorum. Cadit asina et est qui subleuet eam; perit anima et nemo est qui reputet.” Et beatus Gregorius in Regesto, Epistula cclii, scribit Iohanni episcopo Prime Iustiniane dicens: “Nomen nos pastorale non ad quietem, sed ad laborem suscipisse cognoscite. Exhibeamus ergo in opere quod signamur in nomine. Sacerdocii prerogatiua si recta ratione pensemus, sollicitis et bene gerentibus in honore, negligentibus autem profecto in onere est. Sicut igitur laborantes et circa animarum salutem sollicitos hoc nomen ante Deum [et] eternam ducit ad gloriam, ita desides et torpentes uergit ad penam.” Ea autem in quibus pastor laborare debet determinant. Alcuinus super illo uerbo dicens, Iohannis ultimo, cum dixit, “Petre, pasce oues meas:” “Pascere,” inquit, “oues: est credentes in Christum, ne a fide deficiant, confortare; terrena subsidia, si necesse est, subditis prouidere; [et] exempla uirtutum cum uerbo predicationis inpendere; aduersariis obsistere; errantes subditos corrigere.” Hec Alcuinus. Et beatus Gregorius in Regesto scribens Columbo episcopo, epistola cxvi, “Ecce,” inquit, “lupus Dominicum gregem non iam in nocte latenter, sed in aperta luce dilaniat, et nos eum grassari in ouium nece cernimus et nulla ei sollicitudine, nullis uerborum iaculis obuimus. Quos ergo fructus Domino multiplicanti<s> gregis ostendimus, [igitur] si et ipsum quem pascendum suscepimus otiosa mente cernimus a bestia deuorari? Studeamus igitur cor nostrum terrenorum pastorum imitatione succendere qui hiemales noctes imbribus geluque constricti ducunt sepe peruigiles, ne uel una ouis et forte non utilis pereat. Quam, etsi insidiator ore mordaci momorderit, quomodo satagunt, quibus cordis anhelant estibus, in quibus uocibus ut eruant captum pecus, angustia stimulante, prosiliunt, ne a grege domini quicquid per incuriam perdiderint exigatur? Vigilemus ergo, ne quid pereat, et si captum forte quid fuerit, uocibus diuinorum eloquiorum ad gregem dominicum reducamus.” Hec Gregorius. Et Ambrosius ait in libro De officiis, *Et habetur*, xii, qu. ii: “Aurum ecclesia habet, non ut seruet sed ut eroget et subueniat in necessitatibus,” et infra. “Nonne dicturus est Dominus sacerdoti, scilicet: Cur passus es tot inopes fame mori? Et certe habebas aurum, ministrasses alimonium. Cur tot captiui in commertium ducti nec redempti, ab hoste occisi sunt? Melius fuerat ut uasa uiuentium seruare quam metallorum. Hiis non posset responsum referri. Quid enim diceret? Timui ne templo Dei ornatus deesset? Respondet: aurum sacramenta non querunt, neque auro /12va/ placent que auro non emuntur. Ornatus sacramentorum sit redemptio captiuorum et uere illa sunt uasa preciosa que redimunt animas a morte. Ille uere est thesaurus Domini qui operatur, quod sanguis eius operatus est.” Hec Ambrosius. Et Gregorius in Regesto, Epistola ccxxvi, scribit Cypriano rectori patrimonii ut ex nomine ipsius litteras omnibus Iudeis habitantibus in patrimonio ecclesiae transmittat, in quibus et promittat omnibus ad uiam salutis qui in Christo Ihesu est uolentibus uenire, papam dimisurum partem certam pensionis ad quam ecclesiae obligabantur et cuilibet proportionabiliter secundum illud in quo tenebatur. Et sic faciebat ille beatus pontifex melioris conditionis, quantum ad hec, neophitos quam alios Christianos ecclesie subiectos. Cuius rationem ipse

548–553 s. Gregorius Magnus, *Reg. ep.* 5.16 = CCSL 140: 282–283 554–557 Alcuinus, *Comm. in Joan.* 7.44.645 = PL 100: 1002 554–555 Jo. 21:17 558–568 s. Gregorius Magnus, *Reg. ep.* 2.39 = CCSL 140: 126 569–577 s. Ambrosius Mediolanensis, *De off.* 2:28 = Gratianus, 2.12.2.70 = ed. cit., col. 710 578–587 s. Gregorius Magnus, *Reg. ep.* 5.17 = CCSL 140: 273

549 uos MS pastoris *ed.* 550 signaui MS 552 nomen] non MS 553 urgit MS 554, 557 Alchimus MS
555 Christo MS 561 Domino] animo MS 563 succedente MS hic malos MS 564 sepe] semper MS una
ouis] nuncionis MS Quam] Queque MS 565 uoraci *ed.* 566 ut eruant] exuunt MS 567 exigant MS
568 fiunt MS 570 egrotet MS 571 amistrasses *sic* MS 572 ad hos te MS 574 dicetur MS 575 quam MS
sacrarum *ed.* 578 Christiano MS

assignat, dicens: “Nec hoc inutiliter facimus, si pro leuandis pensionis oneribus eos ad Christi gratiam producamus, quia et si ipsi minus fideliter ueniunt, hii tamen qui de eis nati fuerint iam fidelius baptizantur. Aut ipsos ergo aut ipsorum filios lucratur; ideo non est graue quicquid de pensione pro Christo dimittimus.” Sic ergo non debet esse graue si quicquid de temporalibus bonis exponat ecclesia pro malis Grecis, quia si ipsi fuerint boni, sin autem, aliqui de filiis eorum, cuius experientiam manifeste comperimus.

Gregorius etiam papa VII omnibus Christianis scribit ut patet in suo Regesto: “Gregorius episcopus etc. omnibus Christianam fidem defendere uolentibus salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Notum uobis esse uolumus hunc uirum presentium portitorem, dum de ultramarinis nuper reuerteretur partibus, apostolorum limina et nostram presentiam uisitasse. A quo, sicut a plerisque aliis cognouimus, gentem paganorum contra Christianum fortiter inualuisse imperium et miseranda crudelitate iam fere usque ad muros Constantino- politane ciuitatis omnia deuastasse et tyranica uiolentia occupasse et multa milia Christianorum quasi pecudes occidisse. Qua de re, si Deum diligimus et Christianos nos esse cognoscimus, pro miseranda fortuna tanti imperii et tanta Christianorum clade nobis ualde dolendum <est>. Et non solum dolere super hac re debite solitudini nostre sufficit, sed animas pro liberatione fratrum ponere [in] exemplum redemptoris nostri et debitum fraterne caritatis a nobis exigit, quia, sicut ipse pro nobis animam suam posuit, et nos debemus pro fratribus nostris animas ponere. Scitote igitur nos in misericordia Dei et in potentia uirtutis eius confisos omnibus modis id agere atque parare ut adiutorium Christiano imperio quam citius Deo iuuante faciamus. Unde uos, per fidem in qua per Christum in adoptione filiorum Dei uniti estis, obsecramus et auctoritate beati Petri apostolorum principis admonemus ut et uos uulnera et sanguis fratrum et periculum prefati imperii digna compassione moueat et uestra uirtus pro Christi /12vb/ nomine non inuitam fatigationem ad ferenda fratribus auxilia subiecit. Quicquid autem super hac re diuina pietas uestris animis indiderit, sine mora certis legationibus nobis renunciare studete. Datum Rome,” etc. Scribens Hainrico Romanorum regi dicit, “Preterea indico Tue Magnitudini quia Christiani ex partibus ultramarinis—quorum maxima pars a paganis inaudita clade destruitur et more pecudum cottidie occiditur gensque Christiana ad nihilum redigitur—ad me humiliter miserunt nimia compulsi miseria implorantes ut modis quibus possem eisdem fratribus nostris succurerem, ne Christiana religio nostris temporibus (quod absit) omnino deperiret. Ego autem nimio dolore tactus et usque ad mortis desiderium ductus—magis enim uellem animam meam pro hiis ponere quam eos negligens uniuerso orbi ad libitum carnis imperare—procurauimus Christianos quosque ad hoc prouocare, ad hoc impellere, ut appetant defendendo legem Christi animam suam pro fratribus ponere et nobilitatem filiorum Dei luce clarius ostentare. Quam admonitionem Italici et ultramontani Deo inspirante, ut reor, immo etiam omnino affirmor, libenter acceperunt et iam ultra quinquaginta milia ad hoc se preparant ut, si me possunt in expeditione pro duce ac pontifice habere, armata manu uolunt contra inimicos Dei insurgere et usque ad sepulchrum Domini ipso ducente peruenire. Illud etiam me ad hoc opus maxime [me] instigat, quod Constantinopolitana ecclesia de spiritu sancto a nobis discedens concordiam apostolice sedis expectat; Harmenii etiam fere omnes a catholica fide

590–609 s. Gregorius papa VII, *Epp.*, ed. Caspar, *MGH Ep Sel* 2.1, ep. I, 49 = Jaffé 4826 610–636 *ibid.*, ed. cit., ep. II, 31 = Jaffé 4904 618 Joh. 10:11

585 perducamus *ed.* eis] hiis *MS* 587 pensione pro Christo] possessione proximo *MS* 595 uere *MS*
599 nostro *MS* 604 nos *MS* 607 uirtus] iuxta *MS* ferendam *MS* 608 subeat *ed.* 611 a] aut *MS*
612 occiduntur *MS* 621–622 uolunt *post* Dei *ed.* 624 dissidens *ed.* uere *MS*

aberrant et pene uniuersi orientales prestolantur quid fides apostoli Petri inter diuersas 625
 opiniones eorum decernat. Instat enim nostro tempore ut impleatur quod pius Redemptor
 speciali gratia dignatus est apostolorum principi indicare ac precipere, dicens, 'Ego pro te
 rogauit, Petre, ut non deficiet fides tua et tu aliquando conuersus confirma fratres tuos.' Quia
 patres nostri, quorum uestigia licet indigni sequi optamus, partes illas pro fide catholica
 confirmanda sepe adierunt, nos etiam adiuti precibus omnium Christianorum si Christo 630
 duce via patuerit, quia non est uia hominis in manu eius, et a Domino gressus hominis
 diriguntur, illuc transire pro eadem fide et Christianorum defensione compellimur. Sed quia
 magna res magno indiget consilio et magnorum auxilio, si hoc me Deus permiserit incipere,
 a te quero consilium et, ut tibi placet, auxilium, quia si illuc fauente Deo iuero, post Deum
 tibi Romanam ecclesiam relinquo, ut eam et sicut sanctam matrem custodias et eius honorem 635
 defendas," etc.

Cum igitur in eodem periculo, in quo tunc Greci erant, sint et istis temporibus, si homi-
 nes scismatici et tunc et si tunc ecclesie uniri uolebant, et nunc quamplurimi ex eis uolunt,
 et per omnia casus similes sunt, non minus /13ra/ nunc uidetur agendum quam tunc, etc.
 Et sancte memorie Eugenius IV quantum in hac re laborauit, notum est, et, si non in omni 640
 bus, in multis tamen profecit, que coram De<o> pretiosiora sunt omni auro mundi. Aduer-
 tendum etiam est quia iam seculares aliquot rem hanc ex zelo caritatis et fidei sollicitant, ut
 ipsi dicunt, et quamplures super hac re littere hinc inde scribuntur. Dicit enim beatus Gre-
 gorius: "Contumelia sacerdotum est de diuinis cultibus admoneri. Quod enim ipsi debent
 exigere, turpiter exiguntur." Et si aliud fieri non potest, <debet> scribere literas regibus et 645
 principibus et comitatibus Italie, predicatorum aliquos mittere tam ad Grecos quam ad alios,
 et non eos tanquam omnino dampnatos, de quibus sperandum non sit, obliuioni tradere.
 Beatissimus Gregorius Augustinum episcopum ad conuertendum Anglicos siue Britannicos
 transmisit, et Felicem episcopum et seruum Dei Cyriacum in Sardin<i>am et Siliciam ad
 predicandum paganis destinauit; ducem Sardinie, pro eo quod pacem cum barbaris uoluit 650
 habere ut eos ad fidem conuerteret, comendauit. Beatus Leo etiam pro reductione here-
 ticorum multum laborauit et alii Romani pontifices et sancti doctores, nec non minus agen-
 dum uidetur cum non minus infideles, immo multo magis habundent. Dolebat grauissime
 beatus Gregorius eo quod temporibus suis sua, ut sibi uidebatur, negligentia peccata cresce-
 bant, cum tamen perfecte et decore debitum pastoralis officii persoluit. Dicebant enim Lean- 655
 dro de Spaniis archiepiscopo: "Tantis in hoc loco huius mundi fluctibus quatuor ut uetustam
 et putrescentem nauem quam regendam oculi Dei dispensatione accepi ad portum dirigere
 nullatenus possim. Nunc ex aduerso fluctus irruant, nunc ex latere mundi cumuli spumosi
 maris intumescunt, nunc a tergo tempestas insequitur. Inter hec omnia turbatus cogor modo
 in ipsa aduersitate clauum dirigere, modo curuato latere nauis minas fluctuum ex obliquo 660
 declinare. Ingemisco, quia sentio quod, negligente me, crescit sentina uitiorum et, tem-
 pestate fortiter obuiante, iamiamque putride naufragium tabule sonant." Et in epistola ad
 Ioannem episcopum Constantinopolitanum inquit: "Vetustam nauem uehementer confrac-

627–628 Lu. 22:32 644–645 s. Gregorius Magnus, *Reg. epist.* 4.5 = CCSL 140: 221 656–662 *ibid.*, 1.41 = CCSL
 140: 47 663–665 *ibid.*, 1.4 = CCSL 140: 4

625 prestabantur MS 628 Et ante quia MS 629 patri MS 630–632 si Christo - Christianorum *sic ed.*; *om. MS*
per saltum oculi 633 indigent MS magno] magne MS 634 quia *ed.*] et MS 635 et *prim. om. MS* 637 eadem
 MS 642 aliquot] aliam 644 admoueri MS Quod] Oratio MS ipsis MS 646 mitteretur MS 650 pagante MS
 655 decore] de cura et MS: et curam et *fortasse legendum* 655–656 Leonardo Hispalensi MS quater MS 657 partum
 MS 659 intumescant MS Interque *ed.* turbatur MS 661 negligenter MS sententia MS 662 naufragio MS

tam indignus ego infirmusque suscepi—undique enim fluctus intrant et quotidiana ac ualida tempestate quassate putride [et] naufragium tabule sonant.” 665

<Summa superiorum argumentorum>

Ex predictis igitur clare probatum uidetur quod omnes Christiani ex precepto de dilectione proximi a Christo dato obligantur secundum cuique facultatem subuenire Grecis non obstantibus peccatis eorum, inimicitia in Latinos, inobedientia Romano pontifici, scismate et heresibus quibuscunque. [iam] Ex dictis sanc/13rb/torum iam ostensum est quod ratio proximi a perturbatione sumitur eiusdem nature, ut ille proximus dicatur esse qui eandem sortitus naturam specificam est, scilicet humanam, capacem beatitudinis, in cuius communicatione caritas radicatur. Cum ergo in illis semper maneat natura et capacitas beatitudinis, quia maioribus adhuc sunt <similes>, et cum de conuersione nullius sit desperandum, ut inquit Augustinus et supra est allegatum, sequitur quod obligatio subueniendi semper eis manet, potissime quia malis non sunt pro tempore necessitatis beneficia subtrahenda, etiam si <in> hac speciali malitia lapsi reperiantur, scilicet ingratitude, immo etiam si hostes aliquando extiterint uel in futurum esse possint, et non solum unius hominis uel ciuitatis uel gentis, sed etiam totius ecclesie. Quia tamen ex uerbis Christi, Matt. v et Luce vi, in quibus inimicos, etiam persecutores, iubet diligere et eis benefacere, ut sic Christiani ab ethnicis dignoscuntur, ac per sanctum Thomam de Acquino, qui concludit rei publicae hostibus, scismaticis, etc, in tali tempore esse subueniendum, cum etiam ex dictis multorum sanctorum doctorum, quae omnia superius allegata sunt, communi in caritate non esse si Grecis—si possumus et necessitas urgeat—inquantum possumus non subuenimus. Accessum est etiam quod propter regulam caritatis ex mero naturali lumine ad istud conuincimur, cum hoc gentilium, scilicet Aristotelis, Senece, Salustii, Valerii et ceteris auctoribus sit etiam comprobatum. Accessum etiam est nos uere dicere: “Dimitte nobis debita nostra sicut et nos,” <etc.>, cum saltem petentibus debita dimitti libenter dimittimus, et hoc quoad communitatem omnem, licet <est> perfectionis <occurrere> non petentibus, cum nemo occurrere habeat, ut ex dictis Augustini est probatum. Cum ergo nunc Greci petant, <etc.> Ad hoc uenit patria<r>cha senio iam fractus, non dubitans pro suorum filiorum liberatione animam ponere simul cum corpore, tanta maris et terre spatia instante; hoc imperator humillime; hoc supplicat cardinales greci; hoc episcopi, abbates, monaci et alii plures catholici propter quos, ut ostensum est, potius subueniendum est malis quam sint propter malos isti deserendi. 670

Fortificat etiam hoc, ut probatum fuit, quia indies multi Greci conuertuntur et optimi fiunt, propter quam causam Iudeos tollerant ecclesia; similiter etiam quia, si omnia cessarent, minus malum est tollerare Grecos quam Teucros, tum quia nullus ex Teucris conuertitur, ex Grecis multi, tum quia Teucris sunt hostes actu, Greci non, tum quia non persecuntur Grecos sed [quia] Christianos grecos et per consequens Christum persecuntur in eis, pro cuius honore Christiani mori tenentur. Neque satis est negligere alias ciuitates Christianorum quas habent eripere tyrannide, nec est permittendum /13va/ quod istam modo cum aliis destru-

673–674 s. Augustinus, *De bapt.* 4.14.21 = PL 43: 167 678–679 Matt. 5:44 et Luc. 6:27 680 cf. linn. 132–137

671 specificam est] speci uocatio sic MS 673 maiores MS 680 dignantur MS 682 quo MS
684, 686 Ascensum MS 685 hac MS 690 senia MS 700 Neque] Tumque MS

ant. Quod si fiat, erit Christianitati magnum scandalum et iactura, potissime in partibus
conuicinis. Hoc etiam nos uellemus a Grecis si, quod auertat Deus, simili nos contingeret
uexatione uexari, scilicet auxiliari ab eis, et istud est de primis principiis iuris naturalis quod
nullus, etiam ignorantissimus, natura dictante ignorare presumitur, scilicet quid tibi uis fi- 705
eri, etc.

Ostensum est etiam quod et si Greci contemp<n>erent a Christianis auxilium petere in
ista necessitate, ipsa constaret: adhuc Christiani ultra se offerre deberent, tum ad uertendum
eorum malitiam in bono, tum propter liberationem ciuitatis que Christianorum est, mult-
orum sanctorum reliquiis consecrata, doctorum clarificata doctrinis et ad diuinum cultum 710
et propter hunc cultum edificata, cum Constantinus propter cultum religionis Christiane
sedem imperii Romano pontifici relinquens, scilicet Romam, illuc se contulit. Pro cuius con-
templatione et clarissima memoria et maxime quia etiam eius memorie obligamur, illa ciuitas
non est deserenda, immo ut sit perpetuum testimonium ad conuincendum temerarios qui
de imperio sum<m>i pontificis uolunt presumptuose disputare. 715

Fuit etiam probatum istam Grecurum defensionem maxime ad Sanctitatem suam per-
tinere et ad eam ipsam maxime obligari, tum quia ipse pastor omnium est, tum quia in statu
perfectionis est—ita ut non solum illa ad que omnes tenentur, sed multo ampliora perficere
debeat—tum quia <res> circa pascenda gregis est sibi commissa per Christum et omnium 720
gentium pastor uniuersalis est institutus, cuius offitia, ut ostensum est, sunt credentes in
Christo ne a fide deficiant confortare. Quorum omnium in isto negotio prestatur materia,
scilicet errantes Grecos corrigendi, indigentibus et qui maxime petunt subueniri <dandi>
exemplum diligendi inimicos et benefaciendi illis, et omnibus etiam Christianis exhortandi
Grecurum aduersariis, scilicet Teucris, obsistere, et eos coercendi, cum de iure possit, ut
latissime ostensum est, nam potestatem habet super omnes fideles et infideles. Potest 725
namque ab infidelibus terras Christianorum quas tenent repetere et ne alias acquirant im-
perare, ad recipiendum predicatorum Verit<at>is compellere, ne contra naturam aliquid
agant reprimere, et si egerint castigare. Et super hiis, omnibus modis honestis quibus de
facto punire eos poterit, potest de iure. Quid ergo uel ad quid data est tanta potestas si non
exercetur? potissime nunc, ubi isti non solum ui captas Christianorum terras non intendunt 730
restituere, sed alias conantur rapere; Christianos predicatorum non recipere sed ipsam Chris-
tianitatem euertere; contra naturam in proximos seuiunt et Machometi [ad] abhominatio-
nem in ciuitate /13vb/ Constantinopolitana propagare possint. Potest ergo et debet papa eos
reprimere, punire, refrenare quantum potest; ad hoc aurum habet ecclesia et ad hoc collata
est sibi temporalis potestas; ad hoc ipsum inducunt suorum predecessorum exempla ut beati 735
Leonis, beati Gregorii primi, Gregorii VII et domini Eugenii et aliorum <ut> dictum est
supra.

<Exhortatio finalis>

Consideremus ergo iniurias Christianis illatas: carceres, mortes atque uincula que a fre-
quentibus nunciis ex oriente uenientibus intelligimus. Innumerabilia enim sunt pericula que
ceruicibus Christianorum fratrum et proximorum nostrorum imminent et continue inferun- 740
tur. Illa enim Teucrorum natio, postquam peccatis Christianorum exigentibus tota Asia occu-
pata eam[que] partem Europe quam Greci incolant, Thraciam, Macedoniam, Illiricum,

702 in ante magnum MS 705 ignorantie MS 708 uincendum MS 713 maxima MS obligatur MS
716 nostram MS 718 quem MS 722 quia MS 723 exhortandi] dandi MS 724 coercere MS 725 habet]
licet MS 738 illatos MS 739 periculo MS

Epirum, Bulgariam Albanieque magnam partem subegit, plus solito in Christianos seuiit, non religioni, non ordini, non dignitati, non sexui, non etati parcentes, non uagienti miserantes infantie, conducentes insuper singulis annis in seruitutem ex reliquis dictarum, 745 quas supra memorauimus, aliarumque prouinciarum magnam Christianorum captiuorum multitudinem, crudelitatibus omnibus seuiantes brutorum animalium mercatorio more <in> eos, dum pater filium, filius patrem, uir uxorem, uxor uirum uenundari distrahique in diuersas prouincias et regiones uidet atque conspicit, o infelicitatem omnium infelicissimam! calamitatem <eorum> atque seruitutem. Quorum plurimi, cruciatus illos mentis corporisque pati non ualentes, fidem Christi abnegant. Neque hiis contentus, Turcus ipse determinatis namque et statutis temporibus ad omnes Christianorum prouintias sua sub seruitute degentium exactores quosdam transmittit et ex singulis Christianorum familiis unum saltem adolescentem baptizatum, qui ad militarem disciplinam idoneus uideatur, ad impiam Machometi sectam de sinu manibusque lacrimantium extorquent et rapiunt. Hec tot et tanta 755 dira Christianorum imminetia pericula, afflictiones, cruciatus, calamitates et uaria mor<t> is genera uersari debent ante oculos nostre mentis. Quis enim ita a fide Christiana, ab humanitate, a caritate alienus existit qui non moueatur animo et merore afficiatur audiens Christianos tot calamitatum generibus uexari? Certe qui huiusmodi tormenta atque pressuras patientibus non miseretur durus est. Sed forte Deus omnipotens, cuius iudicia 760 iustissima sunt, tantam atrocitatem uersus peculiarem suum populum Christianum fieri permittitur ut cum totus fere Occidens mutuis discordiis et bellis continue magis opprimatur /14ra/ et nulla pene ipsius pars huiusmodi calamitatibus uacua sit — itinera enim latronibus infesta et clausa, maria obsessa piratis, bella ubique seuiunt et orbis mutuo sanguine madet, ut [cum] nec diuina nec humana precepta nec caritas nec humanitas ipsos ad pacem deducere potuerint — saltem deterrimis tot periculis ceruicibus omnium imminetibus ad concordiam deducantur, quod maximum ad impetus infidelium comprimendos remedium esset. Presertim si sanctissimus dominus noster ponet etiam <uitam> suam in manibus suis, et reges et principes uenerarentur apostolicam sedem et summum pontificem, ut sua auctoritate ac potentia pace inter Christi fideles stabilita <et> composita, uires suas et ecclesia<e>, 770 catholicorum principum et aliorum Christianorum ad tantam infidelium superbiam atque rabiem conterendam parare posset. Verum ad huius necessarie pacis opus perficiendum remedia possibilia temptanda sunt, ut perpetua uel saltem temporalis pax aliqua in Italia sequeretur, ut ciuitas illa Constantinopolitana, in oriente fidei Christianorumque arx et monumentum, salubri celerique remedio imminenti periculo proxime liberari et conseruari 775 possit. Preterea quod reg<n>um Cypri, quod superioribus temporibus propugnacula fidei catholice erat, maximis subiaceat periculis manifestum est, et quod sub tributo sit et quandam ignominiosam et miserabilem seruitutem paciatur iam omnibus notum est, ut pro honore nominis et regis Christiani referre pudeat. Et quod miserabilius et infelicius est, omnes pene prouintie Christiane regno predicto circumiacentes eiusdem periculo subiecte uidentur, et maxime quod tam Thureus quam Soldanus magnam classem parare proponit, ut asseritur. Quid plus? Totus fere Oriens Christianus atque Septemtrionis magna pars aut seruitutem plusquam per Pharaonem illatam tollerat aut de proximo, nisi Deus iuuerit, pati formidat.

Sed finem querelis; ad remedia possibilia recurrendum esset. Exhortandi ergo uidentur 785

743 Albanieque MS 744 dignitas MS 744–745 parcentes, miserantes, etc.: *mallem* parcens, miserans miserantes] miserentur MS 747 seuientem MS 748 eos dum] eosdem MS 755 et *alt.*] tum MS 758 moueatur] indueatur MS, ut *uid.* 761 Christianis MS 762 fero odiens MS opprimantur MS 764 preatis *sic* MS 766 deterutius *sic* MS 768 ponetur MS 771 aduersus tantum MS superbis MS 774 -que arx] grex MS 775 proxima MS 780 ponere MS circumacentos *sic* MS

reges et principes Christiani, et precipue prelati et persone ecclesiastice, ut prompto animo pro Dei laude, pro fide catholica, pro Christiana religione ad hanc necessariam Christianorum defensionem pro uiribus se paratos disponant, pro qua non solum huius seculi caducam et continuo pereuntem substantiam exponere, sed etiam mortem ipsam minime formidare debemus. Proponamus ante mentis nostre aciem Diuitem illum purpuratum 790 purpureis Lazari non miserentem, et qualiter superba mens eius <grauiori> retributione dampnata sit illo qui miseras, calamitates atque pressuras paciuntur. Huiusmodi nostri similes sunt, de eodem nobiscum formati sunt luto, eisdem compacti elementis. Quicquid paciuntur et nos pati possemus; uulnera ipsorum existimemus propria et omnium proximorum salutem clementi /14rb/ pensatione cogitemus. Liberalem enim atque munificum Dominus 795 noster Ihesus Christus remuneratorem se constituit, cum eterne uite gloriam in futura temporalia largientibus pollicitus sit. Speramus in Domino, cuius causa agitur et qui dixit, “Confidite quia ego uici mundum,” quod huiusmodi infidelium conatus sic faciendo frangerentur. Et interitus quos Christianis minantur in ipsos redundabunt, si fideles ipsi quod ad eos attinet efficere procurabunt, quod ad omnes attinet: hoc unum precipuum et singulare <pro- 800 positum>. Et quilibet secundum eius gradum et qualitatem penset omni diligentia atque cura ut culpa careat. Quod si quis effecerit, homini accidere <n>ulli potest quod est horribile aut pertimescendum, eaque cum careamus omnia humana placate et moderate ferenda sunt. Conscientia enim recte uoluntatis maxima est consolatio rerum incommodarum, nec ullum est magnum malum preter culpam, ut Cicero ait. 805

Postremo quantum possum, humiliter supplico prefato sanctissimo domino nostro, cuius est ista corrigere et emendare, pro cuius gloria et honore coram Deo et hominibus sic insulse hec scripta sunt zelo meo, (licet forte non secundum conscientiam) si in aliquo erraui <ut> indulgere dignetur. Laus Deo clementissimo.

797–798 Jo. 16:33 804–805 Cicero, *Tusc.* 3.34

792 illi MS 794 omnem MS 797 Sperantes MS 803 omnium MS 804 est] si MS

2. Leonardus Datus, *Carmen ad Nicolaum Papam V in Thurcum Mahomet* (1453/54)

An epyllion, modeled on Catullus or Ovid, by a papal secretary and humanist. Particularly noteworthy is the prophecy at the end: that Prester John would come to the aid of European Christians and that the Holy Land would be recovered and Islam definitively beaten. Since Leonardo urges the pope to send out “oratores” to pacify the wars of Italy, the work must have been composed before the Peace of Lodi (9 April 1454) and was probably written before November 1453, when Nicholas sent out his first formal peace legations.

MSS: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Chis. J V 194, fols. 19v–26r, s. XV med., round humanistic bookhand with corrections and annotations in the hand of the author (**C**); Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Ricc. 660, fols. 63r–68v, s. XV 3/4, round humanistic script, original binding (**R**); Florence, Biblioteca Riccardiana, Frullani 17, fols. 84r–90r, s. XV 3/4, humanist cursive bookhand (**F**); Rome, Biblioteca Corsiniana, Corsin. 582 [45 C 17], fols. 114v–119r, s. XV 4/4, humanistic cursive (**Co**); Rome, Biblioteca Corsiniana, Rossi 230, fols. 181v–186v, *inter* 1464–1485 (**Ro**). The text in Padua, Biblioteca Universitaria, MS 254 has not been collated.

EDNS: 63 lines only (12–13, 29–36, 63–70, 114–125, 174–175, 181–186, 196–202, 242–248, 283–286, 294–300) were edited by F. Flamini in *GSLI* 16 (1890), 65–69; of these, 20 lines (181–186, 196–202, 294–300) were reprinted by Pertusi in *Testi inediti*, 259–63.

BIBL: See Pertusi, *Testi inediti*, 259–60.

The two apparatuses contain, respectively, (a) manuscript variants, and (b) authorial glosses from the Chigi manuscript, written in a second hand, probably that of the author. The *notabilia* in the right margin are taken from the Chigi manuscript, where they are written in the hand of the copyist.

Leonardi carmen ad pontificem maximum N<icolaum> papam Quintum in Thurcum Mahomet

Maxime pontificum, caelestis ianitor aulae	[Prohemium]
In terris, o cura hominum et protector eorum,	
Audi me, nec uana loquor, dum spiritus alto	
Vrget in excessu pendentem promere cladem	
Quam uideo iratumque Deum. Iam iam horrida Ditis	5 [Tractatus]
Porta patet, Sathan Furiis agitantibus exit	
Imperiumque manu deserti suscipit orbis	
Ac circumiectis oculis, postquam omnia lustrat,	
Aspicit inमित Mahomet: nuda ille cruentus	
Constantinopoli uictor ueniebat ab urbe.	10
Hic, ait ille, meus quem tota mente poposci,	
Hic est ille comes scelerum cui lurida mundi	
Sceptra dabo et poterit nihil exitiale uideri.	

tit. sic C: Leonardi dati florentini Carmen ad pontificem maximum Dominum Nicholaum Papam Quintum in Mahomet Turchorum regem *R*: Leonardi dati *etc.* in Thurcum Mahomet *CoF*: in Turcum *Ro* 4 uiget *CoR* 8 At *R* 12 fortasse lucida 13 et poterit, *etc.*: cf. *lin. 150 et Stat. Theb. 1.34*

Tum compellat eum dictis, sic ore locutus:	
"Inclyte Rex, cuius uicti uirtute tumentes	15 [Sathan ad Mahomet regem
Byzanti squalent, est ut iam Martia tellus	
Langueat et possis Italos frenare superbos,	
Imperium tibi iure datum. Iam numine laeso	
Illorum Christo sese discordibus armis	
Dislaniant uariis, nunquam sanabile uulnus:	20
Tanto equidem illorum succendi corda furore.	
At tibi classis inest qualem nulla aequora quondam	
Senserunt; cunctas comples et milite terras,	
Nec te Pannonus nec Bulgaris implicat hostis.	
Quid si christicola quisquam te Regulus usquam	25
Impetat? illexi tua iam in solatia reges	
A Gange in Gades quos omnis terra salutat,	
Reges diuitiis et saeuo Marte tremendos.	
Vt uerum fatear, quae tanta insania genti,	
Tanta superstitio Christum uidere latrones	30
Inter distentum morientem Heloique uocantem	
Nequicquam tumuloque datum? Venerantur eundem	
Mortalemque deumque simul, natumque patremque.	
Tu uero sanctum Mahomet sanctumque prophetam	
Confessus colis atque indulges legibus ultro	35
Quas generi humano seruando in secula finxit.	
Est opere pretium (neque enim spernenda cohortor)	
Vt sedem Romae statuas, thronus urbis et orbis	
Et terror populorum, ibi Piscatoris in ara.	
O stultos homines! Piscator numen habetur,	40
Insternatur hara, himnitum diffundat in auras	
Cornipes, et crepitu tremat undique et undique templum	
Pro cantu salium et disuerberet omnia rumor.	
De strage haud quicquam dico; furor ipse ciebit	
Vulneraque et mortes inhumataque corpora passim	45
Circumfusa, patri Mahomet gratissima dona.	
Tum gens cuncta simul tete maria omnia circum,	
Circum omnis terras solum cognoscet ouantem	
Regem terrarum qui fasque nefasque ministres,	
Dum sanctus Mahomet toto celebrabitur orbe	50
Aut saltem solus (quicumque est ille deorum)	
Verus et aeternus cuncta indistincta tenebit.	
Haec fient duce te quae non Epirius heros	
Marte sagax, non et Macedo audentissimus unus,	
Non Caesar nullique duces nullique potentes	55
Aut populi aut diui quondam potuere nec ulli	
Maiores Thurci nec fratrum ignaua caterua,	

24 Pannonius R Bulgaris Ro ex corr.: uulgaris CCoFR, prim. man. in Ro 26 imperat Co 27 Gangis F ex corr.
31 Helyque CoFRRo 36 pinxit MSS 53 Epyrotius F 56 quondam] numquam R 57 nec] aut FRRo: fratrum aut Co

Quos tu, quos merito. Totus tuus iste triumphus,
 Tota tua haec est laus, et tantae gloria famae.
 Nunc age, rumpe moras, hac et terrestria castra 60
 Inuenient campos uirides, hac aequora classem
 Tuta uocant, tecumque adero quocunque necesse.”
 Dixit, et horrendum uisu mox tempora circum [Dona
 Illius apponit centum dyadema cerastis
 Consertum ac dextre, cui Cerberus ore trifauci 65
 Eminent horrificus, sceptrum implacabile donat
 Scrutatusque oculum candenti tetra Megaerae,
 Addicit leue digito, et superalligat ensem
 In femur, ensem atris immersum Acherontis in undis;
 Huic os allibat patulamque insybilat aurem. 70
 Tum rex horribili iamdudum percitus ira [Mahomet rex ad Sathan
 Amnuit et breuius uerba interrupta minatur:
 “Per Styga, per Manis quibus est hoc ense litandum
 Quem mihi (sentio enim) cinxisti ad mille ruinas,
 Intrabo Romam et factis toto orbe sonabo. 75
 Nec me seu Veneti domini maris altaque puppis
 Aragonum Genuaeque manus in naue feroces
 Et dux Sfortiades et diuitis astus Etrusci
 Seu cruciata sonans iactaeque ad nubila turres
 Terrent; ut glacies primo lentescit in estu, 80
 Sic horum certe leuia inter praelia uirtus
 Concidet. At potius fugient caeca antra petentes,
 Perculsi terrore nouo patriamque tueri
 Audebunt pauci et summum expectare furorem:
 Ignauum genus oblitum uirtutis auitae. 85
 Quippe, ut uera mones, sunt omnia numina mecum,
 Et sanctus Mahomet mihi mundi mandat habenas
 Famamque aeternam. Dum me comiteris euntem,
 Sathan fide pater, Romam peto; Roma triumphus,
 Roma meum decus est.” Nec plura, atque impiger omnis 90 [Exercitus Mahomet
 Inde uocans proceres turbas indicit ituras.
 Adsunt innumerae peditumque equitumque phalanges
 Ex Asiae Europaeque plagis spectataque bello,
 Pectora et arma, genus uarium quot littus harenas
 Vix numerat, promptique omnes aut eminus hostem 95 [Comparatio
 Figere et incautum fallaci ludere taelo
 Aut prope pugnare largumque haurire cruorem.
 Tum distinctae acies, tercentum millia Chroiam
 Ire iubet terrestre iter et rapida urere flamma
 Ac totidem Ungariam furiali uincere bello; 100
 Hinc omnis simul Hesperiam gens caetera classi

59 est hec *CoRRo* 62 quocunque *F* 70 Hinc *MSS* 80 aestu *Co*] extu *CFR*: usu *Ro* 81 praemia *Co*
 83 horrore *F* 92 -que *prius om. Ro* 98 in *marg. add. man. alt. F*: ciuitatem *Albanie* 101 simul omnes *CoRo* experiam *F*

Deditur; immittit tercentum carbasa ponto Plaena uiris, plaena armis et clangore tubarum. Sic Thurcus ruit aere salum spumantibus undis, Sic abit occiduas terra conuersus in oras, Venturus Latio et complet clamoribus aera.	105	
Ac uelut ictus aper furiis accensus in hostem Irruit aut tygris prolem si perdidit ipsum Exilit in furem rabido indignata furore, Vertuntur Mahomet necnon et Thurca iuuentus In Latium tenduntque inuisam extinguere gentem. Nec cessaturi, nisi dum cruor altus ubique Fluctuet et flammis rapidi simul omnia radant. Extemplo nebulis languescit tabidus aera.	110	[Comparatio [Comparatio [Prodigia
Et pater omnipotens dextra tremefecit Olympum, Continuo terram excutens et fulmine crebro Corpora sternit humi penitusque furentibus Austris Vertit mille domos, mille a radicibus ornos, Cum subito actonitus mugit Neptunus ab imis Sedibus et perdunt Tytania sydera lucem.	115	
Terretur mundus, tanquam si secula summa Deueniant: multi uotis pia templa saluant, Supplicibusque alii placantes numina lustris Vndique discurrunt; illos amentia prorsus Occupat, hi plangunt, crudum et miserabile uisu. Caelicolae interea, quot celsas aetheris arces Ex Habel habitant haec usque ad secula iusto, Vt sensere suis tantam pendere ruinam Conueniunt, celerantque ipsi praecurrere cladi.	120	[Terror
Hinc tristes ante ora Dei: miserere malorum Tantum, miserere tui per uulnera laeti: Genti christicolae successim triste precantur. Ille autem tacitus crucis appendebat in ara Praeclusis oculis surdaque immobilis aure. Id caeli regina dolens et pectora plangens Voluitur ante pedes Christi, sic ore locuta: “Nate, quid expediit te nostra intacta tenerent Viscera et effigie carnis uestitus adires Infandam mortem et crudelia uulnera ferres? Nempe ut Christicolas raptos a morte perenni Funditus exturbes? Quae te, dulcissime nate, Caepit durities? ut qui spreueret dolores, Spreuerunt mortes, imitati semper ad unguem Quicquid ab aeterno iussisti, hos iusta precantes Contemnas? an Ausoniam uis perdere gentem	125	[Caelicolae
	130	
	135	[Virgo mater ad filium
	140	
	145	

106 aera *CFR*] aër *CoRo*
132 successum *CoF*

109 Prosilit *F*110 inuentus *Ro*113 ledant *Ro*129 percurrere *Ro*

Et sponsam ecclesiam et Romam quae ianua caeli est?
 Scilicet ut Sathan ruptis compagibus Orci
 Bacchetur sinis et mundum submittat Auerno?
 En comitem inuenit fidum cui lurida mundi
 Sceptra det, et possit nihil exitiale uideri.† 150
 Si postquam nuper Bizantia menia uicit,
 Urbem illustrem amplam quam nedum Thraces habebant
 Argolicique patres longo tot secla decori,
 Sed gens omnis, lingua omnis tollebat ad astra,
 Is dedit excidio permiscens cuncta cruore, 155
 Non impubes, non uirgo sanctaeque parentum
 Reliquiae, non templa tuo splendentia cultu
 Euasere truce dextram pollutaque languent
 Omnia sub Thurco sceleratae legis alumno.
 Ecce furit terraque marique nefanda uorago 160
 Christicolum Sathan totum impellente furorem,
 Nec solum stragem sed iam truciore minatur.
 Hei mihi, quid sensi? non est hoc federis archa,
 Non urbes aliquot castigatique rebelles
 Antiquae legis: properat detrudere nomen 165
 Vsque tuum; properat penitus confundere Olympum.
 Impius hoc audet? quae gens tam barbara tantum
 Insanit? miseram concessit Vandalus olim
 Italiam; mox et Gothus qui moenibus altae
 Insedit Romae; tum Longobarda potentum 170
 Gens fecunda ducum; post intrauere feroces
 Quam multi: nullum tanta haec insania uexit.
 Si peccata hominum spectas, dulcissime fili,
 Quid Christi meruere? quid haec ignara popelli
 Turba? quid insontes immaturaeque puellae? 175
 Quanquam etiam cecidit hic quem tua dextera primum
 Plasmarat culpamque tuus cruor ipse redemit,
 Iam nisi tu clemens alto miseraris amore,
 Subsistet nemo propriis confisus in armis,
 Dum contra Demon semper mala retia tendit. 180
 Aspice me, fili! per lac perque ubera quae tu
 Suxisti, per sanctorum merita ampla tuorum
 Quos cernis madidos lachrimis ante ora precantes,
 Perque crucem mortemque tuam, per dona salutis
 Aeternae: succurre tuis, succurre cadenti 185
 Ecclesiae, uerae sponsae, populoque redempto.”
 Talia uoce refert atque in singultibus ipsis
 Concidit; illam autem uirgo Zebedeius heros
 Mox amplexatus quantillum subleuat ulnis.
 Tum Christus (neque enim oranti miserescere matri 190 [Christus ad ipsam matrem
 Non potuit) reserans oculos atque ore sereno

182 Sumpsisti Ro

188 Zebedeius heros: sc. s. *Iohannes apostolus*

191–192 reserans — ait om. Ro

Haec ait: "O genetrix, equidem non desero Romam,
 Non etiam ecclesiam populumue cruore redemptum,
 Nec contempno precesque tuas lachrimasque meorum.
 Sed paulo intenta repetes haec altius aure: 195
 Nosti pontificem quo non prestantior alter,
 Qui culmen uirtutis habet: pater optimus idem
 Repperit ecclesiam quassam penitusque ruentem,
 Obsessam et uitiis et auaris mille tyrannis.
 Ad me suspiciens cepit mox oppida et arces 200
 Pacificus necnon sublata schismatis umbra
 Romanam sponsam ritu stabiliuit honesto.
 Ingrati populi sese discordibus armis
 Vndique discerpunt ac preda et sanguine fedant.
 Hinc et inaequalis spoliant et dente rotato 205
 Rumpunt in rabiem; hinc falso crimine Christos
 Incusant, uexant scelerum noua scuta suorum;
 Hinc bona templorum rapiunt, his ponere leges
 Audent et pensi nihil est in mentibus atris
 Vt pastorem etiam hunc lacerent: en ipsa uidentur 210
 Parua; uel ulterius tolerari crimina possunt?
 Et iam mille tubas, sanctorum exempla uirorum
 Mille habuere; tamen frustra si Vandalus olim
 Compluresque alii Latium intrauere furentes:
 Nil gens ipsa timet nulloque horrore mouetur. 215
 Cernunt hi uallem Iosaphat tumulumque reclusum
 Soldano regnante meum nec Rhodia tandem
 Relligio fortesue duces regesue potentes
 Eius ab imperio rapiunt. Quis Bullius armis
 Inclytus aut ardens Burgundio? quisue capessit 220
 Immortale decus bello? sinit ille Granatham
 Obscenam ante oculos; mollem sinit iste Thunetem
 Dum sese infodiant. Quotiens pater ipse colenda
 Nicolaus eos uoluit componere pace?
 Nec uoluere: uident urbem, caput orbis Eoi, 225
 Euersam, horrorem mundi, Thurcumque frementem,
 Nec tamen assurgunt nec mutua pectora mulcent
 In commune bonum propulsandasque ruinas.
 Hi sunt Christicolae, hi sunt quos ipse redemi?
 Errabant leuius nec tantum lumen habebant 230
 Quos mersi uastis imisque in fluctibus archa
 Sub Noe superante salum? Scit Nyniua mitem
 Esse Deum, tandem missis erroribus ipsis?
 Scitque Ezechias lacrimis cum fleuit abortis?
 Cum uero populum hunc nec fas nec tanta mouerent, 235
 Preclusis oculis permisi excurrere Sathan

206 et *post* hinc *add. Co*
 quos *transp. Co*

219 Bullius: *sc. Janos Hunyadi*

220 Burgundia *Co: Burgundo Ro*

229 sunt hi *ante*

Et Thurcum infando simul aduentare furore.
 Sistant obduri: Thurcus pessundabit urbem,
 Italiam Europamque omnem, tum denique Sathan
 Respuet et sacris iam tum caput abluet undis, 240
 Incuruans papae et mundum ditione tenebit.”
 Dixerat, et nutu matrem solatur amico.
 Illa tamen solers iterumque iterumque Tonantem [Virgo mater
 Suspicit et finem rebus pendentibus orat
 Anxia, tam dirus ne quis magis irruat ensis. 245
 Tunc et caelicolae tristes intenta tenebant [Coelicolae
 Ora salutantes illumque illamque uicissim.
 Sic anceps curis totus pendebat Olympus.
 Audisti, pastor, quae raptus protinus hausi [Leonardus ad papam
 Peruigil: en etiam tantis te oppone procellis. 250
 Ecce uides Thurcum horribilem excidiumque ferentem
 Et cladem extremam, Sathan celerante furorem,
 Iratumque Deum; tamen hic te laudibus ornat.
 Hinc oratores quibus est tota Itala uirtus
 In manibus cupidosque tuam discernere mentem 255
 Et parere tibi et pacem obseruare paratos.
 Adsistunt regina potens et turba deorum
 Assidue intenti lachrimasque et uota refundunt.
 Quin etiam, modo confidas, Rex aetheris ipse
 Hanc tibi prestiterit palmam. Furor ille timendus 260
 Aspectu primo est, sed mauult parcere, mauult
 Corda hominum erecta nostramque audire salutem.
 Dic pacem: quamcunque iubes, pax alta sequetur.
 Sola quidem uox ipsa uolans inimica retundet
 Castra, nec audebunt propriis considerare regnis. 265
 Accipient nostri uires, Mauortiaque arma
 In Thurcum simul inuertent. Hoc magnus Hiberus
 Anxius expectat altaeque Georgia terrae.
 Surget Scytta ferox et qui descendit ab Indis
 Tartarus extremis gelidos habitare Triones. 270
 Nil aliud Rhutenus auet Vahiuodaeque Thurcis
 Arduus et quisquis Thurcorum accingitur oris.
 Caesar adest secumque omnis Germania quanta est.
 Nec Galli ueterum memores nec laetifer Anglus
 Nec minor Hesperia quos euehit otia degent. 275
 Christicolaeque alii cernentes arma latina
 Surgere, et armatos heroas inire furentis
 Qui mundum domuere olim tum littore ab omni,
 Totius Italiae uolitare per aequora classem.
 Accrescet nobis acie Charamannus aperta 280

243 -que] atque *Ro*262 hinc *post* erecta *add. Co*263 quacunque *Co*275 et *post* Hesperia *add. Co*

268 *Georgia*] ea est quam ueteres Hiberiam appellarunt et Christiani sunt. Posui utrunque nomen ad plenior
 expressionem. 269 *Scytta*] posui duplex ‘tt’ propter quantitatem ut ‘relligio’ ‘rettuli’ et huiusmodi.

Aemulus imperii Mahomet, fessumque superbus
 Consternabit eum et centena in frusta secabit.
 Tum Presthoiannes princeps orientis in arma
 Quam primum exiliet optataque bella parabit
 Soldanumque premens primo Babylonda tumultu 285
 Illius extrudens manibus facile omnia uincet,
 Inde per Aegyptum perque usque Athlantica regna.
 Quale lucrum dabis ecclesiae et caelestibus auris
 Eternumque tibi meritum, dum Thurcus et ipsa
 Impia gens ueluti puluis perflantibus Euris 290
 Sternentur, terramque sacram Christique sepulchrum
 Extincto scelerum cultu tu ad prisca reduces
 Ac solus toto Deus agnus habebitur orbe?
 Haec audax equidem cecini, sed crede canenti.
 Crede mihi, non uana loquor, uenere profecto 295
 Secula tot nobis per te paritura triumphos.
 In te nostra salus, in te exaltatio nostri
 Numinis et uires reuocat gens aurea mundo,
 Dum pacem iubeas Italis et cepta secundes.
 Da pacem: quamcunque dabis, pax alta futura est. 300

285 premet *Co* 288 dabit *FRRo* 297 teque exaltatio *R*

283 *Tum Prestoiannes*] Posui hunc secutus opinionem nostrorum popularium hominum et facit ea fabula ad hanc rem, quamquam a 270 annis citra ibi eiusmodi potentie christianus rex non extat. Vltimus autem fuit Nestorinus, et ipse a Tartaris superatus. Insuper multi opinantur ibi Indiam esse, cum sit Ethiopia. Christiani autem sunt, et baptizati non in igne, sed in aqua, in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, et etiam circumcisi, eoque glorianur quod praeter ceteros seruant utranque legem antiquam et nouam. 285 *Babylonda* posui propter aurem.

3. Georgius Vallagussa, *Epistolae duae contra Turcum* (1453/59)

Two examples of the kind of anti-Turk letters sometimes found in private correspondence, though in this case, as usually, the letters were meant to be circulated among the author's literary acquaintance.

MS: Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Acq. e doni 227, fols. 70v–71r [V.21] and fol. 180r–v [XII.11], an epistolary containing Vallagussa's letters in twelve books. The manuscript is fully described by Resta, who gives a complete register of the contents.

BIBL: G. Resta, *Giorgio Vallagussa: Umanista del Quattrocento* (Padua, 1964); on the letters, see especially pp. 194 and 313.

[Book V, Letter 20]

Georgius Valagussa <Iacobo Venier> Archiepisco<po> Ragusino s. p. d. Ut feliciter contra Turcum pugnet deprecatur.

Si unquam Deus ipse orandus fuit, impresentiarum sane exorandus esset qui tibi palmam contra Turchum immanissimam beluam concedat. Cuius uires sane aliquantulum formido: captam Constantinopolim iam cernimus, in diesque Turcus potentior ob Christianorum desidiam in nos consurgit, cuius insolentiae nisi hoc in principio resistatur, sique Christiani principes tepidiores fuerint, horreo ne maximam stragem miserrimamque seruitutem Christianis sit allaturus. Omne malum nascens facile opprimitur; inueteratum fit plerumque robustius. Te idcirco Nicholaus pontifex delegit qui exercitu classeque insigni huius monstri uires contundas. Quare, quantum cura, labore, uigiliis, auctoritate, prudentia efficere poteris, nihil praetermittas quod ad extirpandum ad extinguendumque Mahometi prodigium nulla uirtute redemptum a uitiiis ualeat. Quid enim per Deum immortalem non summo pontifici solum, sed in omnibus terris gestum gloriosius, quid laudabilius, quid Deo gratius erit? Hominum memoriae sempiternae istud sane erit, istud te per ora uirum uolitare faciet. Quapropter iam uela immortalitati tuae pande, iam alas illi impone. Demonstret uirtus tua incredibilis Turcum ipsum iuueniliter exultantem Fabii more aliquando naufragium turpissima nece pati. Nec quicquam tam robustum, tam terribile est quod immortalis Deo ubi uoluerit resistere queat. Vale, fidei propugnator acerrime. [Ferrara, late 1453 or early 1454]

14 Ennius apud Cic. *Tusc.* 1.15.34

[Book XII, Letter 11]

Georgius Valagussa eruditissimo Bonino Mombreto s. p. d. Commendatio in summum pontificem Pium secundum ob illius concilium.

Ita est profecto ut dicis, uir optime, magnum ac omnium pene necessarium incoeptum quod summus pontifex ardentissimo fidei amore aggressus est. Ecce enim, licet annis paululum grauior sit, Romanam urbem summi pontificatus sedem relinquens Mantuam perexit, quandoquidem ibi omnibus principibus ad conuocandum concilium commodior locus foret, quo profecto, ueluti optimus pastor ouile optime conseruans, Christianam fidem iam aliqua ex parte laesam defenderet ac tueretur. Sed auxilio non paruo ac regumque ducumque

praesidio opus est ut saeuissimi Turci uires contundere queat. Cui, cur immortalis Deus
tantum exercitum, tot copias addiderit, me penitus latet. Occulta enim sunt nobis iudicia 10
dei. Heu, heu, quam timeo; heu, quam timeo, inquam, ne ipse iustissimus Deus magnam
cladem cunctis Christianis ob immensa scelera, fraudes, periuria, incestus, fastus ac immen-
sam habendi cupiditatem, caeteraque obscena facinora, quibus humanum genus impraesentiarum implicatur, sit illaturus! Heu, quam timeo ob Christianorum lentam congregationem
ac copiosissimam fidei tepiditatem maximum detrimentum nobis imminere, ni diuina 15
claementia nos respiciat! Heu, timeo per Deum immortalem ac totus fere contremisco ne
maximam calamitatem Italia iam iam sit passura! Utinam in hoc mendax reperiar! Utinam
Deus omen hoc auertat! Attamen, accedat nobis quodcunque decretum est ab alto, laudan-
dum est, praedicandum atque extollendum summi pontificis consilium quo fortasse diuina
ira aliquo pacto placabitur. Nunc, nunc summis precibus utendum est ut hoc sanctissimum 20
concilium ex sententia summi pontificis cunctis principibus ad hoc concordissimis felicem
exitum consequatur. Sic, pater omnipotens mundi qui sceptrum gubernas, extinguas Tur-
chum tu pietate tua. [Milan, June 1459]

4. Antonius Beccadellius Panormitanus, <*Epistolae pro parte Alfonsi et Ferdinandi regum contra Turcas*> (April 1454–before February 1459)

Some examples of public correspondence regarding crusade written by a humanist for a sovereign power. Panormita writes in the new, classicizing chancery style that came into fashion in the mid-quattrocento.

MSS: This edition is based on Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Barb. lat. 2070, entitled “*Epistolae et legationes Alphonsi et Ferdinandi Regis scriptae per Antonium Panormitam.*” Mbr., s. XV 3/4, 60 leaves. The manuscript is an autograph of Panormita. For this MS and several *codices descripti* made from it, see G. Resta, *L'Epistolario del Panormita: Studi per una edizione critica* (Messina, 1954), 35.

BIBL: J. F. Bentley, *Politics and Culture in Renaissance Naples* (Princeton, N.J., 1987), 165–68.

SACROSANCTO CARDINALIUM COLLEGIO ALFONSUS REX SALUTEM DICIT
[fols. 2r–3v].

Post memoriam nostram nihil profecto cecidisse recordamur quod nos adeo commouerit aut tantam indignationem animo iniecerit quantam Constantinopolitanae urbis casus et Graecorum miseranda atque inaudita calamitas. Neque uero ob id solum indignamur, quod Graeciam, quae magna pars Christianae gentis est, amissa libertate oppressam et in manum ac seruitutem infidelium per Christianorum negligentiam redactam et a Christiano corpore distractam atque discissam uidemus, quamquam est id grauissimum et quod omnium Christianorum mentes atque animos magnopere commouere atque excitare in ultionem debet, set etiam quia turpissimam et indignissimam notam nomini Christiano ob eam rem inustam cognoscimus et quae numquam ullis consiliis, periculis aut laboribus aboleri posse uideatur. Quid enim tam indecens, tam turpe, tam pudendum Christianis quam pati Christianos a barbaris opprimi et acerbissimo seruitutis iugo subiici fidemque nostram labefactari atque funditus euertere, pro qua tuenda et conseruanda dubitare debet nemo qui Christianus re sit mortem impigre oppetere? Sed haec communis culpa sit. Dum enim alii alios intuemur ante Constantinopolis calamitatem si quis in eius defensionem arma capiat et obsistere iniuriae conetur, ciuitas illa interim capta est et cum illa omnis Graecia concidit. Capite enim confracto et cetera membra quassata sunt. Cum autem quotidie intelligamus ex multorum sermonibus ac litteris ipsum Turchorum principem in eam insolentiam ac furorem prouectum esse ob res secundas, quae solent animos extollere atque inflamare, eumque non contentum Graeciae captiuitate minitare caeteris Christianis atque e Graeciae claustris in Italiam uelle erumpere imperium orbis terrarum sibi promittentem et Christianam fidem euertere molientem, instituimus animo illius furori pro uiribus nostris obsistere conatusque eius nefarios quantum in nobis fuerit reprimere atque infringere, sperantes Christo Deo nostro auctore atque fautore, pro cuius fide defendenda hanc expeditionem gloriosissimam suscepturi sumus, ut et alii principes ac populi Christiani una nobiscum ad salutem sacrosanctae romanae aecclies exemplo nostro excitentur ac fore ut illum atrocissimum fidei hostem non solum ulciscamur et intra Graeciae terminos cohibeamus, sed etiam ut recuperata omni Graecia ipsum e tota Europa depellamus ac ne in Asia quidem sua quietum esse sinamus. Quae cum ita sint, Reuerentias Vestras oratas uolumus primum, ut uos ipsi qui fidei Christianae duces estis in eam tuendam et conseruandam omnes uires et studia uestra conferatis, nec eam ruere patiamini cuius protectores acerrimi merito esse

debetis, ut aliis exemplo sitis qui ad uos oculos referunt, qui quid agatis intuentur, cum ad uos primum qui estis religionis capita acceptam iniuriam et cladem hanc pertinere existiment. Deinde ut cunctos populos, principes ac reges Christianos per legatos ac litteras quoad fieri possit exhortemini atque excitetis ut et ipsi exemplo uestro nostroque hoc et necessarium et maxime gloriosum bellum suscipiant et pro eo gerendo quas possint copias, classes, arma et commeatus parent. Si pro fide nostra tuenda, in qua est salus nostra reposita, non depugnabimus, pro quo dimicare sustinebimus? Si feramus iniurias Christo Deo nostro factas cuius ille imagines deleuit sanctorum ac martyrum, statuis euersis, reliquiis luto peruolutis, sacris uirginibus incestatis, filiabus e complexu parentum ad stuprum raptis, parentibus ipsis crudelissime necatis, si has inquam feramus, cuius tandem iniurias ulciscemur? Si religionem nostram ruere per negligentiam patimur, ut omittamus ignominias, captiuitatem, uincula, cedes quae Christianis impendent, quidnam sperare amplius de animarum nostrarum salute possumus? Multis sane ac summis principibus, ut Constantinum ac Iustinianum omittamus, tum domus nostre quae barbarorum semper oppugnatrice fuit, tum aliarum nationum ac gentium, maximo honori ac gloriae fuisse scimus Christianum nomen auxisse ac diffudisse. Quanto igitur nobis omnibus honestius et gloriosius fuerit illud ab ruina et manifesto interitu uindicasse? Quod si nulli nobis adiutores fuerint ad tantam iniuriam uindicandam malumque propulsandum, quod existimare non possumus, nos tamen propositum nostrum exequi contendemus, sperantes in Christo Deo nostro rem prospere successuram. In quo etiam si mori contingeret, laeto et constanti animo moriemur.

Neapoli primo Aprilis MCCCCLIII.

KALISTO PAPE [fols. 3v–6r].

Tribus ad nos litteris Sanctitatis Vestrae simul respondebimus planumque faciemus nobis longe alienum propositum esse quod de nobis (suasu fortassis aliquorum) Sanctitas Vestra conceperit. Tum litteras ultro citroque missas, si necesse fuerit, exhibebimus quo planius innotescat nos a suscepto semel instituto nequaquam uariasse. In primis nobis cruciatae bullam misisse scribitis, exhortantes nos uelut principalem executorem seu ducem ad expeditionem contra Theucrum suscipiendam, nihilque ea in re a nobis hactenus reportasse. Ego, pater beatissime, et si satis intelligo ad tantam belli molem compluribus aliis et quidem maximis rebus opus esse praeter bullam, nihilominus Sanctitati Vestrae oblatum munus non renuo nec paruifacio. Quod quidem proinde in hunc usque diem distuli quod alios Europae principes et auctoritate et industria et peritia praestantiores rem ipsam suscepturos arbitratus sum. Nunc uero quoniam reliquos ad eam rem torpescere uidemus et Sanctitatem Vestram id a me uehementius in dies expetere, haud defuturus sum officio Christiani regis, sperans potissimum quod eadem Sanctitas undequaque ut decet adiutura sit conatus nostros. Siquidem Sanctitatis Vestrae euulgatissimum uotum amodo fructum reipublicae Christianorum pariturum est. Tum iam ulterius rem produci non suadet Christianae religionis hostis audacia et uigilantia.

Quod autem demirari aut potius detestari uidetur Sanctitas Vestra. Accepisse enim se scribit nos Iacobum Piccininum sacrosanctae Romanae aecclisiae hostem in oppidum nostrum recepisse ac fouisse. Quomodo, beatissime pater, oppidani nostri aut debuere aut potuere oppido hominem expellere qui nullum eiiciendorum hostium a nobis mandatum habuissent, etenim nulla ibi futuri belli suspitio adhuc apparebat? Et si debuissent aut uoluissent, quomodo poterant tam ualidum exercitum propellere? Oppidulum itaque commune omnibus praeoccupantibus concessum fuit, quo loco postea Iacobus amicos nescio quos de se ac Nicolao patre benemeritos nactus commeatu et pecunia adiutus fertur. Qua igitur in culpa nos erimus, si, quo gentes Sanctitati Vestrae accedere minime curarunt, ille peruenit? Si ab amicis et suis et paternis humaniter et benigne, nobis procul absentibus ac nescientibus, exceptus est? At tu latrunculo illi per triremes tuas commeatum et

pecuniam subministrasti. Non ea ratione, pater beatissime, frumentum et quae ad oppida munienda necessaria sunt Castilionem misimus, ut aduersariis aecclesiae (qui et nostri sunt) prospiceremus, sed quod de nostro more oppida atque arces nostras praemunitas esse percipimus ut non spe ac fide sociorum, a quibus aliquando decepti proditique fuimus, sed ut nostra ope ac prouidentia tutae in omnem rerum euentum esse queant. Magis autem conueniens fuerat meminisse. Nam Sanctitas Vestra id plenius nouerat nos olim ab adolescentia unionem et concordiam aecclesiae diligentissime simul et faustissime procurasse, remota penitus ab orbe terrarum omni Christianorum dissensione ac scismate, tum etiam nosmet uniuersam Marchiam Anthonitanam a quibusdam copiarum ductoribus occupatam recuperasse et aecclesiae integram restituisse, idque et nos gratis egisse, non spe aliqua remunerationis aut lucri. Id cum memoria repetisset Sanctitas Vestra, facile consilium nostrum in sacrosanctam Romanam aecclesiam deprehendisset utique purum atque sincerum neque nos impedituros suspicata esset, sed potius adiuturos expeditionem in Theucros, pro qua nimirum et regna et corpus et uitam ipsam libentissime profusuri sumus. Pacem uero Italiae, cuius ipsi non mediocres auctores fuimus, et seruare uehementer uolumus et quantum in nobis erit etiam protegere. Sane intelligimus, si expeditionem in Teuchros ueram et efficacem esse cupimus, Italiam prius omni ex parte pacandam esse, id quod Sanctitas Vestra nutu facere, modo uelit, potest. Quapropter Sanctitatem Vestram maxime oratam uelim, ut eius exemplo cuius uicarius existit, non solum pro amicis sed pro inimicis etiam Deum precetur, indignatiunculaque deposita Iacobum Piccininum, quod in manu uestra est, sibi reconciliet atque recipiat in gratiam. Latrunculum enim, immo latronem, in cruce Christus dominus respiciens miseratus est et Petro non septies modo, sed si septuagies septies peccator lapsus fuerit, modo peniteat, admittendum et amplectendum esse respondit.

Postremo, quod in ultimis epistolis Sanctitas Vestra significat, se quatuor legatos de latere creasse quos statim missura sit ad excitandum uniuersum Christianorum orbem aduersus Theucrum Christi domini hostem infensissimum, magnam Sanctitatis Vestrae laudem et gratiam habemus. Sed tum longe maiorem laudem et gratiam habituri sumus tumque et hortationes uestrae efficaciores futurae sunt, cum iam ad imitationem Christi facere et docere ceperitis.

Ad reliqua uero, quoniam ita tum epistolaris angustia, tum uel maxime apostolicae sedis reuerentia exposcere uidetur, per oratores nostros confestim respondebimus et eo quidem modo respondebimus quo iam de nobis merito laeta et contenta esse debeat Sanctitas Vestra, quam Omnipotens feliciter nobis augeat et conseruet.

XXVIII Augusti MCCCCLV.

KAROLO REGI FRANCORUM [fols. 6r–7r].

Coniectamus iam neminem teque maxime non latere, Karole rex illustrissime, pacem Italiae magno consensu omnium firmatam fuisse, eo uidelicet consilio ut Macumetto Turchorum regi potentissimo atque acerbissimo Christianorum hosti concordēs consentientesque Christiani ipsi promptius commodiusque obsisterent. Utque et hoc perficeretur, fuerunt qui commoda sua plurima ac maxima paruifacerent nec non graues et intolerabiles iniurias pietatis ac ueri Dei causa dimitterent. Pace uero composita necesse fuit plerosque, ut in pace fieri consuevit, militum partem dimittere, quod inter caeteros contigit Venetorum senatui. Nam cum crederent Iacobum Piccininum, praestantissimum copiarum ductorem, sibi in praesens amplius usui non fore, illum bona cum uenia ac gratia a se dimisere. Qui Iacobus recte ac iuste uiuendi consilium capiens statuit per nos nostramque operam cum aecclesia et illius capite pontifice maximo collocari. Nos uero rem piam, iustam et pontifici et Christianis omnibus profuturam rati, non semel et per literas et per solennes oratores pontificem pulsauimus uti hunc ad stipendia sua qualiacumque conduceret, etiam per Maiestatem Nostram eo pacto communicanda ut in Dalmatiam cum eius

copiis dimitteret, non utilem solum sed pernecessarium per hoc tempus sibi et uniuersae Christianorum religioni futurum. Pontifice uero adhortationem nostram negligente fortassis in Theucros non armis opus esse, sed orationes dumtaxat sufficere opinante, praenominatus Iacobus in Senensem agrum iter destinauit, neminem in itinere cum exercitu offendens. Antea uero quam ad Senenses appulisset, illos per nuntium saepenumero rogauit uti pecuniam Nicolao patri ab eis iure optimo debitam ultro restituerent. Quod cum saepius rogati facere renuissent, et indignatione motus et necessitate compulsus Iacobus, ut interim exercitum alere posset, contra Senenses arma mouit. Quo cognito statim pontifex nescio qua ratione ingentem exercitum comparatum in Iacobum mittit. At ille, ut qui neque possit neque uelit sacrosanctae aecclesiae uiribus resistere, apud Castilionem oppidum nostrum quasi in sinum nostrae clementiae se recepit. Quapropter Maiestati Nostrae perquam honestum uisum est hominem perire non sinere, qui ad nos, aliorum ope destitutus, iniuria affectus, supplex confugisset, presertim qui eius uiri filius esset qui ob eius immortalia in nos merita, cum arma et insignia nostra, tum Aragoniae illustrissimum nomen ad posteros meruisset. Quin uel eo maxime seruandum esse iudicauimus quod et ipsum et Nicolaum patrem magnis et memorabilibus beneficiis de sacrosancta aecclesia benemeritos esse satis scimus.

Haec eo pertinent ut intelligat Maiestas Vestra pacem Italiae ob bellum in Theucros suscipiendum capessendumque factam; Iacobum Piccininum quam maxime ad id bellum et utilem et oportunitum; pontificem magna ac necessaria omittere, minima consecrari; me uero parare quotidie pro uirili terra marique in Theucrum expeditionem. Postremo, quod huius epistolae praecipua causa fuit, uti mecum pontificem hortaremini ad maturanda<m> in Theucrum expeditionem, ab eo in initio pontificatus solenni ac diffamatissimo uoto susceptam. Instat enim perniciosissimus religionis nostrae aduersarius et, ut aiunt qui ex Cicladum partibus adueniunt, iam Rhodum obsidet, ad nos ilico transiturus, nisi ignauiam et somnum protinus excusserimus. Nam quantum ad concordiam inter Senenses et Iacobum attinet, ipse procurauero. Auetote et rem Christi ac Christianorum per Deum rogatam pro uirili uestra omnes mecum suscipite. [August 1455]

CARDINALIUM COLLEGIO [fols. 7v–8r].

Puto ego uestrum preterire neminem, Patres Reuerendissimi, quibus litteris aut oratoribus exhortatus atque obtestatus sim Kalistum pontificem maximum ut pacificata Italia mox nostras omnium uires atque opes aduersum Christi hostem infensissimum Macumettum Turchorum principem cogeremus pugnaremusque una pro salute ac religione communi. Quod cum ego totiens frust<r>a tentassem, siquidem obduratum uidetur pontificis cor, non ab re fore putauī Vestris Reuerentiis id ipsum renuntiare ut intelligeretis uos super ea re culpa etiam non uacatos, certe qui ad gubernandam rempublicam Christianorum propositi rem Christianam prolabi uideritis et pertuleritis, non consilio dirigentes, non auctoritate corrigentes quem pro officii dignitate et dirigere et corrigere uobis unis datum sit. Nam per immortalem Ihesum, quae mens aut consilium est uidere Turchum quotidie magis magisque inolescere ac Christianos conterere ac delere funditus adniti, et pati aerarium beati Petri ac substantiam omnem non pro Christo sed contra Christianos profundi? Velle obstinato animo Christianos potius perdere quam emendare atque homines potius quam uitia insectari? Num putatis Europae principes caecos aut nullos esse? An potius pro rei indignitate aliquando contra uos ipsos conspiraturos? Praeterea ignorandum non fuit utcunque aduersarios uincendos esse potius quam armis contendere, in quibus anceps euentus est et interdum qui uincere confidunt superantur. Ego, patres reuerendissimi, ut de me dicam, non satis intelligo, dum haec tam praepostere per pontificem geruntur et a uobis perferuntur, quomodo meum exequi propositum, quomodo flagrante bellis ac dissensionibus Italia ex ea, in qua non modicam partem possideo, discedere queam. Christus itaque uiderit aut cuius

peruicacia aut quorum negligentia res sua deserta sit. Ego quidem Christo ipso beneiuuante rebus meis consulam. Vos, ne, dum perdere funditus aduersarium contenditis, in status uestri discrimen incidatis, prouidete ac ualete.

[August 1455]

FRANCISCO MEDIOLANENSIVM DUCI [fols. 8r–9r].

Cum intelligerem, dux illustrissime, Iacobum Piccininum ad expeditionem contra Theucros capessendam perutilem fore, tentavi crebro illum cum Sanctitate domini nostri papae conducere, quoque facilius res effici posset, stipendiorum partem ipse pollicitus sum. At pontifex, nescio quo Christianorum fato, hoc ipsum, non sua quidem natura quae perbenigne est, sed maliuolorum quorundam suasionem, non modo neglexit, sed (ut nouit Excellentia Vestra) in eum arma conuertit. A quo proposito ut aliquando desisteret et mea causa et Christianorum commodo frequenter Sanctitatem Suam obtestatus sum. Verum ille adhuc proposito praestat quo mihi nihil esse per haec tempora aut molestius potest aut incommodius. Quare per immortalem inter nos futuram amicitiam uos petimus et rogamus ut nostri gratia et pro Christianae religionis commoditate apud Sanctitatem eius etiam per legatos intercedere uelit<is> atque enixissime conari ut ab Iacobo praenominato exercitum reuocet illumque quod in manu sua est in gratiam recipiat. Quicquid uero Excellentia Vestra interprete aut deprecante inter Iacobum et Sanctitatem eius conuenerit, nos acceptum ferimus ratumque suscipimus ac firmissimum fore pollicemur. Amplius Fraternitati Vestrae spondemus de caetero Iacobum non minus uoluntati uestrae quam nostrae obtemperaturum uestrumque perpetuo futurum. Hoc cum Fraternitas Vestra fecerit, planum esse incipiet quod clarissimus uir orator uester Albericus de uestra erga Maiestatem Nostram beneuolentia atque obseruantia quotidie praedicat. De uoluntate uero nostra erga Excellentiam Vestram hoc maxime argumentum uobis sit, quod tam fidenter tamque ingenue haec a uobis petere ausi simus, non minora sane beneficia aliquando reddituri quam accepturi. Auetote.

XXII Augusti MCCCCLV.

DVCI VENETOQUE SENATVI [fols. 9r–10r].

Cum intelligeremus Iacobum Piccininum copiarum ductorem e stipendiis reipublicae uestrae dimissum iri pace firmata, optimum factu rati sumus ad stipendia summi pontificis, quantum in nobis esset, illum cum copiis suis omnibus conuertere. Ita quidem instans in dies Macumetti perniciosissimi Christianorum hostis periculum suadere uidebatur, ita dignitas atque tranquillitas Italiae. Quod ut efficeretur, non solum saepe et litteris et solenni legatione aut pontificem hortando, orando atque obsecrando institimus, sed etiam partem stipendiorum non modicam polliciti fuimus. Quod cum a pontifice nescio quo fato omitteretur negligereturque, accidit ut praenominatus Iacobus a Senensibus paternum debitum repetens cum consequi non posset, illis arma intulerit. Qua re maxime commotus pontifex ingentem exercitum in Iacobum et parauit et misit. Nos uero hactenus supersedimus, expectantes commoti belli exitum quem breui fore opinabamur. Nunc uero cum perspiciamus rem produci et magis magisque exasperari, etiam atque etiam pulsare pontificem statuimus et per solennes oratores nouissime orare uti posthabitis rebus minimis ad necessaria, uidelicet contra Theucrum, animum intendat. Eo maxime quod certo scimus Iacobum praedictum, quae a Senensibus ceperit, restituere omnia paratum esse seque honestati atque iustitiae submittere. Praeterea Theucrorum regem, infensissimum Christianae religionis hostem, ualidissima classe insulas et loca iuxta Rhodum obsidere moxque, nisi obstiterimus, in Italiam traiecturum. Haec ideo uobis nota esse uoluimus, princeps illustrissime, uti ad id ipsum, si honestum uidebitur, pontificem nobiscum hortaremini. Namque, ut plenius nouit Sapientia Vestra,

satis scimus pacem Italiae proinde maxime ingenti omnium consensu factam esse ut facilius promptiusque bellum susciperetur aduersus Theucros, nec commodum esse hoc maxime tempore circa minima tempus teri quae a pontifice ipso, modo uelit, nutu componi ac conciliari possunt. Vertendas esse cogitationes et potentias nostras, si quae sunt, in eum qui Christi domini religionem euertere enixissime conatur. Italiam omni ex parte pacatam pacificamque relinqui optimum esse. Hoc nos, ut persuadeamus pontifici, iterum atque iterum studemus. Ad quam rem perficiendam uestrum etiam ut diximus auxilium inuocamus. [August 1455]

DVCI VENETOQUE SENATVI [fol. 10r–v].

Litteras uestras XVIII Augusti datas accepimus, quibus lectis uehementer indoluimus <neque> epistolam neque mentem nostram a uobis recte interpretatam fuisse. Nam, dum dicitis non uideri uobis salua honestate rem Iacobi Piccinini aggredi posse absque offensione summi pontificis aliorumque confoederatorum, nos non ea ratione predicti Iacobi reconciliationem cum summo pontifice uobis persuadere conabamur, ut pax Italiae aut pontificis gratia aut denique honestas ipsa uiolaretur, sed potius ut pontificis dignitas et Italiae pax et foedus semel initum conseruaretur, tum uel maxime ne pro re minima sacrosancta atque honestissima in Theucros expeditio praepeditetur. Pernecessarium quidem nobis uidebatur, si bellum contra Theucros re, non uerbis suscepturi sumus, Italiam prius omni ex parte pacandam esse. Quapropter quae facile componi possent, componi debere, ne ob res parui ac prope nullius momenti maximae et immortales res posthaberentur. Et hoc quidem maxime ad honestatem pertinere arbitrati sumus, nec solum ad honestatem sed etiam ad religionem nostram, ad pontificis existimationem, ad Christi domini tantopere a Macumettanis offensi ac denuo pene crucifixi debitam ultionem. Et quis melius aut recentius nosse potuit qua constantia, qua fide, qua caritate foedus et societatem seruauerimus quam uos, idipsum totiens bello proximo experti? Et uos igitur praesertim credere debuistis nos haudquaquam aliis suasuros aut petituos quod minime facere nos solere uobis constaret. De nostra igitur mente posthac Christus uiderit, de cuius re maxime agitur, isque nobis pro sua benignitate et auxilium et consilium praestiterit. [August–September 1455]

KALISTO PAPE [fols. 11v–12r].

Ex litteris Sanctitatis Vestrae ad reuerendissimum patrem Dominicum apostolicae sedis legatum, tum etiam ex ipsius legati sermone intelleximus Sanctitatem Vestram scire desiderare quale subsidium et nos in expeditionem contra Turchos parandam collaturi sumus. De nobis igitur deque nostro proposito, pater beatissime, ita breuiter accipito: nos quidem ad hanc gloriosissimam expeditionem quae Christi nomine suscipitur promptos esse et in dies promptiores futuros, si cognouerimus Sanctitatem Vestram, ad quam maxime res spectare uidetur, tum reliquos Europae principes ad idipsum incumbere nec consulto ulterius tempus terere, sed facto rem exequi et expedire. Itaque ad hanc rem promittimus decimam partem omnium regiae nostrae curiae redituum et quidem regnorum omnium exponere, exempto ad hoc nemine qui a nostra beneficentia prouisiones aut salaria quoquomodo consequatur. Quin etiam pollicemur recipimusque ita demum agere cum uaxallis et subditis nostris ut hi quoque, consilium et uiam nostram secuti, decumam tribuant redituum suorum. Verum haec omnia fore promittimus, si modo Sanctitas Vestra tantundem constituat uel potius constitutum iam exequatur super aecclesiasticis rebus atque personis. Nam cum religio Christiana ad Christianos una omnis pertinere uidetur, tum maxime ad eos qui illam sacerdotii nomine profitentur, nos quoque et collectoribus siue quaestoribus Sanctitatis Vestrae in regnis nostris, si fuerit opus, adiumento erimus, et in omnibus denique ita nos praestabimus ut neque maiorem diligentiam neque maiorem liberalitatem a nobis desideratura

sit Sanctitas Vestra. Interim quotidie classem exornamus et, si demum perspexerimus Vestram Sanctitatem non de<e>sse et reliquos Europae principes paratos non solum decumam reddituum sed bona omnia et animam ipsam, in Christi nomine effundemus alacriter et libenter. [Autumn 1455]

KALISTO PAPAE [fols. 18v–19r].

Scimus te, pater beatissime, siquidem natura pacificus et humanus es, quid legatus uester, quid uniuersae Italiae oratores de pace mecum egerint, percupide expectare. Nos igitur praesenti epistola ab hoc desiderio uos liberamus dicimusque nos Deo beneiuuante pacem firmasse ac belli societatem iniuisse, per nos utique simplicem atque sinceram. Nam licet eorum aliqui in nos aperte deliquerint, nos tamen et iussu Sanctitatis Tuae et illorum poenitentia ac praecibus moti delicta dimisimus omnemque ex animo iram aut odium abstersimus. Iam tempus erat miserae diuque bellorum calamitatibus uexate Italiae consulere et uires nostras et conatus omnis in Turchum perniciosissimum Christi ac Christianorum hostem conuertere. Ad quam quidem rem haud amplius consulto, sed facto potius opus esse intelligimus. Et hec quidem apud nos acta sunt. Vestrae nunc partes erunt, beatissime pater, Christum dominum summum et singularem Deum orare, uti pax et societas haec firma, sincera, pura et diuturna sit, in laudem et gloriam ipsius Christi et augmentum et tutelam Christianorum reipublicae. [Before June 1458]

REGI PORTVSGALLIAE [fols. 19v–20r].

Non dubitamus, rex inclyte, Maiestati Vestrae notos esse conatus Macometti Turchorum domini, Christianorum hostis communis, quia tanta res latere non potest etiam remotissimas gentes. Sed tamen quia nos, ut ii qui illi propiores sumus, consilia et progressus suos melius ac certius scire possumus, de ea re scribere Maiestati Vestrae decreuimus. Fecit is quidem et facit, ut edocti fuimus ab hominibus non uanis per litteras ac nuntios, apparatus maximos, comparatoque ingenti exercitu parat populos Graeciae finitimos ac iis superatis Italiam ac totum Occidentem inuadere ac nomen Christianum delere si possit, minitaturque Romam primum petere uelle. Nec est dubium, nisi eatur obuiam eius furori atque audaciae, quin breui tempore subactis Illiricis in Italiam erumpat atque inde omnes Christianos crudeliter uexet. Nos uero cogitantes Getas quondam Scythiae populos Italiam atque Hispaniam oppressisse, non possumus non pertimescere huius nefarios conatus et ob eam causam classem paramus qua nos ab eius armis tueamur et, si possumus, Christo adiutore eum etiam laedamus, ne longius extendatur illius rabies. Quod si et Maestas Vestra pro uiribus facere deliberauerit, licebit classi uestrae ex omnibus locis nostris maritimis frumenta et omnia necessaria eodem precio quo classi nostrae licet comparare, neque ullam differentiam inter uestram nostramque classem pro nostra coniuntione ac fraterna beneuolentia fieri patiemur. Plura super hac re non scribimus. Si id unum dixerimus, eum esse praesentem rerum statum, <est> ut ab omnibus Christianis apparatus accelerari oporteat. [Before June 1458]

PRESIDIBVS PROVINTIARVM [fol. 25v].

Quoniam ob Christianorum negligentiam uidemus Theucrorum animos quotidie crescere atque inolescere et, nisi illorum conatibus statim occurratur, de religione nostra ac Christianis omnibus actum esse, statuimus Christo domino adiuuante contra Theucros ipsos summis totisque uiribus expeditionem suscipere, neque ad rem hanc honestissimam atque piissimam perficiendam quicquam omittere quod conducere aut iuuare uideatur. Propterea, quandoquidem ad hoc quod paramus imprimis re frumentaria opus esse intelligimus, uos hortamur atque petimus ut statim

lectis litteris aratoribus seu uulgo massariis omnibus iubeatis ac persuadeatis ut sementem, quam maxime fieri potest, amplissimam faciant augeantque omnifariam legumina atque ordea. Qua ex re et ipsis prouentura est insperata ac certissima utilitas et nobis commodissimum atque acceptissimum facient. Quicquid super hac re ordinaueritis, quicquid auxeritis, quicquid denique uestra de opera atque industria nobis sperandum sit, necne, ilico renuntiabitis ut uel uestrae diligentie acquiescamus uel aliter nobis prouideamus. Valetе feliciter. [Before June 1458]

FRANCISCO MEDIOLANENSIVM DUCI [fols. 55v–56v].

Quousque tandem Macumetti Turchorum regis insolentiam feremus? An usque dum nos imparatos ac desides opprimat? Iam uicta Graecia, occupato Peloponneso, in Italiam magno apparatu transitum parat, Christianis exitium minitatur. Effecturus profecto id quod cogitat, nisi aliquando expergiscamur et Christo bene iuuante arma capiamus atque infestissimo Christianorum hosti totis uiribus obsistamus. Ego quidem, princeps inlustrissime, ut de me interim aliquid dicam, iam hoc propositum ac desiderium mihi paternum est ac uelut in partem haereditatis relictum. Nostis enim iam inde a iuuentute optimum atque inclytum patrem meum, Alfonsum regem, contra Macumettanos bella gessisse et usque ad senectutem perductum in hanc sententiam perdurasse atque etiam morientem mihi mandasse ut et ipse in perniciosissimos Christianae fidei hostes odium non omitterem, immo pro uirili mea uires cogerem, alios ad idipsum principes exhortarer, omnia miscerem donec Christi domini iniurias haud inultas uiderem. Quod in presentia facio, princeps inlustrissime, non ut dux—neque enim mihi tantum arrogo — sed ut unus aliquis ex mediocribus paratus hac in re cuicunque uel pontifex maximus uel principum collegium iusserit parere. Mouet me ad hoc maxime quod hoc tempore pontificem sortiti sumus uitae integritate admirabilem et in Christi religionem uehementer accensum quique nos consilio, auxilio, auctoritate plurimum iuuare et uelit et possit. Suadet temporis locique ratio: in faucibus enim Italiae exultat ferox ille ac truculentissimus Christianorum excruciator, neque aliud expectandum est, nisi nos iam iam amodo excitemur, quam ut nos improvisos capiat, rapiat, exterminet, trucidet et, quod deterrimum est, in Macumetti impiissimam sectam (horresco referens) redigat et impellat. Consilium, arma, uiri, commeatus nobis habunde sunt contra illius perditos conatus, modo nobis ipsi non defuerimus, modo locum delegerimus et caput apud quem conuenientes magno consensu expeditionem hanc constituamus, expediamus, Christum Deum uerissimum causam suam agentem secuturi eiusque diuinis auspiciis pugnaturi et uictoriam proculdubio, si Deo ipsi confidimus, reportaturi. Nam crudelia, nefaria atque impia Turchi ipsius facta, quid hic commemorem? quae nota sunt Christianis et nationibus uniuersis et ab hoc ipso litterarum adlatore, uiro grauissimo, edoceri potestis, quippe qui multa illiusmodi oculis uiderit ac proprius e certissimis testibus audiuerit nobisque retulerit. Vale. [Between 27 June 1458 and 4 February 1459]

5. Hieronymus Guarinus, *Contra Magni Turchi Maumethi Othman impetum cohortatio ad Nicolaum V* (1 August 1454)

Probably this speech, by the untalented son of the more famous Guarino Veronese, was (like Bessarion's *Orationes ad principes Christianos*) never delivered, but rather was intended to circulate among an elite group of humanistically educated readers.

MSS: Preserved in two manuscripts: (a) Ferrara, Biblioteca Comunale Ariostea II.151, fols. 49r–54r, containing works of Guarino Veronese and his sons. Cart., misc., III + 73 + III, round humanistic script, s. XV 3/4, northeastern Italy, probably Ferrara; (b) Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. lat. 1153, fols. 2v–7r, containing “Hieronymi Guarini et aliorum orationes et carmina,” according to the sixteenth-century note on the flyleaf. Cart., misc., humanist cursive, s. XV 3/4. The two copies are independent witnesses to a copy from the archetype or an intermediary.

BIBL: Pertusi, *La caduta*, 2: 504; Kristeller, *Iter*, 1: 58; 2: 427.

Hieronymi Guarini ad Beatissimum papam Nicolaum Quintum contra Magni Turchi Maumethi Othman impetum cohortatio.

Vereor, sanctissime pater, ne imprudentie Tuam apud Sanctitatem arguar si, quod pro sapientia et officio tuo te grauiter obire persuasum habeo et nihilo minus ad acuendam amplius atque animandam illam eloquentissimorum hac aetate hominum ingenia cum summa laude concertant, ego quoque, tenuis homuncio, rudi oratione id aggredi impresentiarum audeam hortarique deprecari ac persuadere ne cultum Christianum ecclesiamque catholicam (qua nihil uerius est in terris, nihil dignius, nihil ad posterum seculi immortalitatem uendicandam certius atque habilis), cuius apud nos Celsitudo Tua principatum tenet et illum immortalem Deum nobis quodammodo fideiubet in terris totiusque Christianae ipsius labefactatae molis propugnatio tua in auctoritate consistit, labi ac perire sinas in tam presenti periculo Christianorumque animorum trepitatione ob incumbens nimiumque iam propinquum Magni Turchi terrorem, totius propter recentem de Constantinopoli expugnata uictoriam exultantis, elati, superbi et se iam capere nequeuntis. Qui, nec dum his contentus atque atrociora minans, horsum toruis inspectat oculis et minabundum quassat caput. Audebo tamen, beatissime pater, sicuti puer olim Daniel inter sapientissimos magistratus in oppressae Susannae iudicio, fretus praesertim facilitate tua, Christi emula, cuius uices apud nos geris, inter tantam ad id studentium aliorum facundiam, pro mea uirili parte et ipse Christianus, Christianam causam de te pendente iuuare atque in hoc comuni praesentique discrimine ἐκ θυμοῦ ipsi tuae Sanctitati commendare. Nec enim res est non a singulis maiorem in modum curanda, et saepe rudiorum uocibus iuuantur peritorum consilia. Ut autem iis, quae minime iniocunda neque inutilia tuam fortasse praeter spem commemoranda incumbunt, propensam atque beniuolam accommodare mentem Tua ipsa Sanctitas uelit, com-

14–15 Dan. 13:45

5 hortari atque *O* 9 tuam in auctoritatem *F* 18 spatium 8 litterarum praebent MSS, graecis ut uid. omissis; ἐκ θυμοῦ suppleui uerbi gratia 20–21 incumbant *O*

unius ei et cuncto Christiano populo atque in summo rerum discrimine pendens causa ultro suadet ac deposcit.

Imminet, beatissime pater, atrocissimum, ingens ac prope desperationis plenum Christianae rei periculum quo, si te sensus tangit ullus gloriae inter mortales comparandae, occasio certe est oblata magna atque unquam fuit tutandi Christiani nominis et conseruandae sanctae Dei ecclesiae a ualidissimo eius impugnatore. Vel si sanctum atque inglorium pectus nulla prorsus erigitur de se buccinante fama, sed mundo surdus unum audire Christum contemplantemque Mariam quam Martam sollicitam sequi mauis, publica quam priuata magis tibi respicienda res est impendentique necessitati conferenda prudenter et accommodanda uoluntas. Expergiscendum est inpresentia, pastor optime, utque excitatus erigas te; incumbit onus atque in tali rerum cardine uirum te ostendas, non feminam, in pontificatum Christique uicarium, qualem antea accepimus, ascendisse. Circumspice atque intueri ad te profusum Christianum populum qui ecclesia est quam tuis geris humeris tuaque ipsa sustines anima; intueri inquam illum attonitum et opem deplorantem. Ecce Maumethus Othman rex Turchorum, Constantinopolitanus imperator suis factus armis, se Romanorum regem uocitans, Caesarem secundum glorians, inimicum Christi profitens, in Italiae limine instans, feruidus, acer, iuuenis, ingentis spiritus, ingentioris redditus, ea secunda ac ualidissima contra Christianos uictoria, consilio pollens, fretus latissimi ac opulentissimi regni uiribus impigrisque ad arma subditorum animis, fortissimas nauales terrestresque inferens copias omni bellicorum genere machinamentorum instructissimas, plures cogens indies, maius robur rerum omnium praeparans, nec languere ac marcescere tantam sinens uictoriam, sed finem unius gradus, iam alterius improbus meditans, totusque huic se attingens—quam terribilis nobis imminet, quam perniciosam uniuersae Christianae genti cladem ac ruinam minitatur.

Et istas, istas inquam Romanas arces quasi iam iam obtenturus spe plenus prospicit, longe truculentius atque immanius ibi saeuiturus ac liberius euomiturus omne efferati animi uirus quam in deuicta mox Constantinopoli. Si enim Constantinopolis uictor, spectans iam tum ad Romana moenia proinde ut Christiane fidei totque sanctissimorum cadauerum sedem ac sacrarium, suae nequiuit impiissimae crudelitati et cruenti ingenii atque animi temperare affectibus, uel dissimulandi causa progrediendique facilius quo flagrabat omnisque humanitatis et gratiae de se significandae, sed cruore et scelere quaquauersum repleuit omnia, uirgines flagitiosis affecit contumeliis, liberos rapuit de parentum complexibus, in omne hominum genus, in omnem aetatem, in utrumque sexum crudelissime atque impurissime saeuuit, phana ac templa mille ipse polluit incestibus, imagines uenerabiles pesundedit, tremenda sanctorum corpora ac reliquias discerpit et canibus in opprobrium dilaniandas obiectauit, — o teterrimum, o inauditum, o abominandum nefas! — sustinet haec immortalis Deus uel sustinentes aspicit nos? At quid acturum illum suspicamur, ignaue ac socorditer imperata atque aperta si a nobis comperiet omnia? Ad ipsam penetret urbem Romam? Dicamne? Dicam sane potius saluis adhuc rebus quam in amittendarum periculo subdiceam? Et ipsam Romam uictor Turchus, fidei persecutor, Christi inimicus, ferocissime obtineat, ultimum iam mentis suae quo direpta est finem et summum suae uictoriae certamen, iam nihil ultra suspicans, nihil formidans aduersi, nihil simulatione uel dissimulatione opus habens, nonne totas truculentie, impietatis, feritatis et plusquam barbarae immanitatis atque irarum omnium effundet habenas? Proh quantus suboritur dicenti horror! Quam futurorum metu mens pauet! Quantam Christiani sanguinis effusionem, quantam templorum,

30 -que *om. O* 47 ac liberius euomiturus *om. O* 50 impiissime *O* 56 discerpit *O* 59 comperiens *MSS*
64 truculente *O* barbare *O* 65 fundet *O*; cf. *Verg. Aen. 5.818*

quantam tot millium sanctorum corporum, reliquiarum et sacrarum rerum indignissimam pollutionem, nefandam prophanationem ac ruinam miseri intuebimur? Atque utinam intueri non liceat in quantam Christiani nominis contumeliam et ignominiam faciet! Sed ea deprecor et, ne accidant, totus tremens te, immortalem Deum, testor. 70

Cur autem non facile accidant, non intelligimus. Respice quaeso, beatissime pater, in tam ancipiti religionis nostrae momento rerumque Christianarum discrimine quam adhuc ubique socorditer cessatur, quanta uniuersos tenet ignauia. Ulciscendarum sane priuatarum, iniuriarum indies inferendarum temere a Christianis ruitur ad arma. Turchi ruentis iam iam impetus et cruentum in nostra uiscera nobis cernentibus mucronem uibrantis pro superuacanei otii habetur nugis aut pro anilibus deliramentis, ut si qui fortasse ad credulitatem quandam nonnihil mouentur, "Si Deus," inquit, "pro nobis, quis contra nos? Ipse futurorum prescius suae nostraeque rei consulat. Si proprium non dubitauit filium ad carnem sumendam pro salute nostra crucifigendumque ultro et morte afficiendum demittere rogante nemine, liberabit et nos longe facilius in praesentia tot orantibus religiosis communisque sibi et nobis causa nos ab imminente periculo tuebitur." Haec atque alia temere iactant[es] in ludibrium fidei, <in> irritandamque potius quam auertendam diuinam iram, quae nouit etiam ubi fuit opus ita cum inimicis suis uindicare inimicos suos quales hi se constituunt. Circumspice et in uniuersas terras uerte oculos: Italia imprimis alioquin illustris et genus insuperabile bello, Gallia, Hispania, Celtiberia, Anglia, Britania, Germania, Pannonia, opulentissimae prouinciae atque armis feroces caeteraeque regiones enumeratu difficiles, Christianum omnes nomen sequentes. Ecce quam socordes iacent et alteri ad alterutrum respicientes quasi aliena, nequaquam sua res agatur et sibi non idem mox, quod proxime, incendium impendeat; hi tantos negligunt motus. At si quis est qui spem de se ullam <capit>, sola pro<hi>bita spe deinceps [ad] opem tergiuersatur et dum resonant "incude Mycenae!" Sed spem inanem dantibus uerbososque indies apparatus (falsus utinam sim uates) et uanas eiusmodi ultro citroque circumferentibus legationes interea inopinato aderit atque incautos hostis opprimet auribusque obstre<n>t ingruentis praeter spem illius horror et insequentium ruinarum fragor plusquam irrumpente olim Italiam Annibale. Tum demum nostram agnoscemus et damnabimus ignauiam, tum merito inextincti Deum frustra implorabimus, tum raptim atque incassum flagrabimus omnem uno impetu moliri opem, tum impotentes uociferabimur, "Ferte citi flammas! Date tela! Impellite remos!" 75 80 85 90 95

Dum suis igitur utrique stamus in confinibus — nostris tamen prior ille occupatis — et tempus adhuc moliendae suffragatur opi, excita potentiam tuam appraehendensque arma et scutum, Tua Sanctitas, tanquam fortis armatus custodiens atrium suum, conspiciatur iam caeteros uel dormientes excitare uel ad se respicientes proprio stimulare exemplo et eorum decutere torporem. Facto, non uerbis, et quidem maturato opus est et post praeces ad immortalem Deum rite factas Moysi manus eleuatione qua in Aegyptios uindictas ciebat, perinde ac magnanimus ille atque omnium praestantissimus Scipio Nasica qui studente nouis rebus Tiberio Graccho ipse inuolutam attollens pro uexillo dextera togam, "Qui diligit," inquit, "rem publicam me sequatur," atque ita concitatis in Gracchum consternatis pridem animis et seditionem et seditionis auctorem extinxit, rem publicam uero incolumem reddidit. Pari modo atque maiore animo, maiore etiam opprimente necessitate insurgens ipsa Tua Sanctitas, crucem sanctam uenerabili amplectens dextera, segnes ac cessantes in tanto 100 105

77 Ro. 8.31 105–106 Plutarch, *Vitae Gracchorum*, itp. Leonardo Aretino, impr. Romae 1470 [= HC 13125], 1: [fol. 232v]

67 corporum *om. F* 69 faciet] rapietur *MSS* 76 crudelitatem *O* 89 hi *om. O* 96 flagramus *O* 97 tunc *MSS* impotentes *scripsi*] impotens mentis *MSS* uociferamur *O*

discrimine principum Christianorum mentes excitet; frequentibus feruentibusque legationibus pulset, urgeat; pontificalis etiam maiestatis auctoritate in hoc dubio religionis et rerum Christianarum momento fulminans cogat. Sicut et ipse Turchus uniuersos regni eius principes aduersum nos feruidus commouet, cuius (falsam aspernantes religionem) impigram sane diligentiam strenuamque et nimium nobis expertam uirtutem imitemur. Fas est et ab hoste doceri.

Iam satis ualide armari interea et educi possunt terra marique Itala de pube cohortes pacatis prius apud nos rebus. Italia nostra uel satis per se sustinere tanti hosti incursum ualida erit uel ipsa prior presentibus animis de more suo descendens in aciem, caeteris sociorditer intuentibus strenuum pudorem incutere. Sunt nobis fortia bello pectora; sunt animi bello et spectata iuuentus; sunt triremes; sunt naues magnitudinis (ut certi ferunt auctores) apud Turchos admirandae ac pertimescendae; sunt peditatus equitatusque lectissimi; sunt generis omnis accerrima armamenta; sunt plures atque unquam temporibus et usquam in orbe terrarum spectatissimique ductores; praecipitur et undecumque in talia consecuti discrimina idonei delectus. Si qua in re opus est caetera prouisione cunctorum opes in unum necessario suppeditantes communiaque consilia et duris ueniens solertia rebus acuent atque explebunt.

Nec a tali te deterreat de nostratibus diffidentia, sed magis cohortetur per similes casus temporum superiorum spectatissima uirtus. Julius Caesar, omnium <imperatorum> meo iudicio princeps, olim in Germania cum bellum gereret eiusque et hostium castra utrinque in conspectu starent, adeo Germanorum corporibus praegrandium et bello ferocissimorum terribilis phama et ipse aspectus pusillos statura Romanos perterruit ut paueret Caesaris exercitus omnino manum cum hoste conserere. Ipse torporem mentium terrefactarum indignatus Caesar, aduocata militum frequenti contione et militari eloquentia eorum animos antehac fortissimos ac prope inexpugnabiles castigans, adhortatus est: Quid nomini Romano id contumeliae atque ignominiae uana formidatione permitterent? Gentis utriusque per tempora anteacta res gestae testimonio essent. — Ubi uero eos restitutos confirmatosque conspexit, Caesar eduxit in aciem collatisque utrinque signis ita pugnatum est a Romanis ut illorum ingentium Germanorum innumerabili strage quaquauersum omnia repleuerint.

Lucullus quoque domi forisque clarissimus, quom Romanum exercitum in Tigranem Armeniae regem deduceret tanta pollentem hominum multitudine [*lac.*] Et Romanos pugnandi causa in eum procedentes prospiciens, satis multos esse Tigranes diceret si ut legati quidem; sin autem ut pugnaturi accederent, perpaucos admodum. Et tamen hi pauci tanta clade hostilem exercitum affecere ut diem illum apud Romanos, antea nefastum, de caetero fastum redderent, et certissimorum auctorum constans sit sententia nunquam solem sub se intuitum esse tantam hominum a tam paucis factam occidionem.

His animis atque armis prima propugnationis initia faciens Tua Sanctitas et sic caeteras Christiani nominis gentes concitans atque animans, hunc teterrimum, impium et confidentissimum insultantem barbarum retundet ac propulsabit ac ne terrae fideles, ne Italia pulcherrima et aliquando rerum domina, ne Christianus populus caeterarum gentium ornatissimus ac praestantissimus, ne denique cultus noster et fides catholica primaria atque unica in ludibrium, rapinam et interniciem te pontificante uertatur atque obruatur. Ita ob-sistes, cum alioquin perennis atque indelebilis apud omne humanum genus et hostes ipsos

128–136 Caesar, *Bell. gall.* 1.39–41 139–145 Plutarch, *Vita Luculli*, itp. Leon. Justiniano, impr. Romae 1470 [= HC 13125], 2: [fol. 17v]

118 ualide *F* 123 doctoribus *O* 128 *lac. fort. post* omnium; <imperatorum> *suppleui uerbi gratia* 131 proterruit *O* 151 unita *O*; cf. l. 229

tantam risuros uecordiam contumelia atque ignominia; apud uero immortalem Deum inexpiabile ac nulla satis luendum poena non futurum non esset delictum.

Legimus Romam post exactos quondam reges inuadentibus Hetruscis effusoque ad pontem Sublicium agmine, quom hostis descenderet hac pene iter intra urbem habiturus, unum Oratium Coclitem animi et corporis uirtute spectatum statim primum pontis aditum occupasse obuersoque se uno atque obiecto tantum irruentium hostium impetum suo Marte suisque uiribus sustinuisse, donec a tergo rescissus pons tutam ab hostili irruptione patriam redderet atque ita seruaret. Non minoris animi Tua inpraesentiarum Sanctitas, quando res uocat, se per hoc ipsum, quicquid erit uirium Italarum, opponens protegere ac seruare a tergo eandem illam urbem, multo amplius Tuae Dignitati quam Coclit patriam illi fortuitam, tibi sapientissimorum tot praesulum, tot pontificum rectissimo iudicio et lectione sanctissimoque mysterio ac diuino officio traditam atque acceptam et propterea alacrius atque audentius tutandam ac protegendam quo iustior iubet causa, grauius incumbit onus, amplior compellit necessitas diuinusque atque humanus adigit pudor. Ille patriae muros et conciuces ac Iouis Capitolium ab hostium impetu seruauit, tu uero, maxime pontifex, Iesu Christi domini et saluatoris nostri uicarie, serua Romam, Romam inquam tuam, praecessorum ac successorum omnium sedem et ecclesiae Dei caput. Serua principum apostolorum Petri et Pauli, tot martyrum, tot confessorum ibidem humata corpora; serua tot sanctas et uenerabiles reliquias; serua non unum populum nec una moenia sed tot populos, tot ciuitates, tot gentes, tot nationes tuae fidei commendatas, ne in ludibrium barbarorum Constantino-politano de more fiant. Serua uniuersam ecclesiam Dei, cuius uices te gerere in terris scimus omnes et propterea ut terrenum Deum adoramus; serua illud late patentissimum ac tremendum gloriosae crucis uexillum. Sinetne illud Tua Sanctitas a barbaris diripi ac pessundari? in quo, ne ipsi pessundaremur, ipse dominus Iesus caelitus missus et Deus homo factus pependit, nec tremuit, multo animosius multoque fortius quam Cocles, ut nos omnes et humanum genus aliquando a perditione liberaret, suum obiicere corpus ac se ipsum morti tradere.

Attolle, pie pastor, oculos tuos; suscipe crucem illam in qua ille humiliter pendens morte affectus nostram ob causam, ne mortem pro se subire timeamus, admonet ultro uiscera nostra in ferri aciem obiicere. Ille tandem mentes nostras perstringit, ille animat, ille mortuus pendens classicum pulsant, tesseram bello dat. Tessera nobis esto Iesus Deus, Dei filius; <eam> audiamus, insequamur et in media arma ruamus. Ipsa triumphale uexillum crux sancta erit; secunda praestabit auspicia pius pelicanus proprium rostro confodiens pectus in salutem nostram. Non deerit pro se subeuntibus nobis in praelia protector Deus noster; ille presto aderit; scuto circumdabit nos ueritas eius; cadent a latere nostro mille et decem millia a dextris nostris; aduersariorum autem conteret scuta et arma confringet. Pleni sunt sanctissimi prophetae, plenae sunt scripturarum omnium uoces, plena utraque testamenta locupletissimis exemplis.

Ab initio, cum Moyses et Aaron uiri Dei cum Israelitico populo, ne ipsi Deo sacrificerent, prohiberentur ab indurati pharaonis peruersitate (quamvis totiens monita, tot euidentissimis diuinae irae signis redarguta foret) expulsique de Aegypto a persequente tanto cum equitatus, peditatus et armatorum ac curruum exercitu infestissimo pharaone ad Mare Rubrum peruenissent, ipso mari late cedente et medium persuadentibus profundum iter sic cum praebente, perinde ac oppositus a dextra leuaque murus diuisam sustineret aquam, ab

155–160 Liuius 2.10 185 cf. Hieron. in Ps. 101 = PL 26: 1127 187–188 Ps. 90:5, 7 191–200 cf. Ex. 14

192 prohiberetur *F* quamquis *MSS*

ipso iusto et omnipotenti Deo educti incolumes euasere; persequentium autem Aegyptiorum
 robur et cunctum pharaonis exercitum demersit in mare, subuertit curruum rotas, quicquid
 hostile fuit perdidit ac deleuit, nec unus quidem superfuit ex eis atque ita in Aegyptios et
 pharaonem glorificatus est dominus Deus. 200

Apud etiam progenitores nostros Maxentio infidelium ingentis multitudinis duce in
 Christianum Constantinianumque nomen insurgente, quom aduersus eos Constantinus,
 quartus ac trigesimus tunc imperium tenens, Constantii et Helenae filius, qui praecessores
 tuos et ecclesiam Dei tanto exornauit Romani imperii munere, armatum exercitum eduxis-
 set anxiusque rebus dubiis angeretur, ei per noctem quiescenti uir adstitit summo oris et 205
 cultus splendore praetendensque dextra Christianam crucem. "Quid paues," inquit, Con-
 stantine? ne paucas huc respice. Hoc signo pugnam capessens fidito ac securus esto uictori-
 amque pro certa iam nunc habe." Excitatus e somno uir fortis armatusque intuens ad solem
 orientem uidit atque agnouit miro fulgore coruscantem crucem angelorum stipatam cateruis
 qui et ad se dixere eadem quae spe et fide plena mox in somnis acceperat. Fidit itaque 210
 Christianus imperator et inermem frontem eodem armans crucis signo, sic et milites omnes
 crucemque ad illius uisae morem struens et componens gemmis atque auro uadit in hostem
 animorum plenus, protendens eam dextera elatam, cuius tremendo ac miraculoso aspectu
 cerneret Maxentium et armatas eius copias incaute ad Pontem Tyberis Miluium, qui medio
 in itinere fuit, progressas, resupinas ac praecipites corrudentem per pontem promiscue in 215
 spumantem fluuium ferri, nec magno cum labore breuique momento atque ingenti ad in-
 terniciem accepta clade, Constantino cruce armato uictoriam de se dare.

Haec illa est crux, piissime pastor, in quam credimus, haec illa per quam seruati ab
 aeterna sumus perditione, haec illa per quam uicimus si fideles sumus, haec inquam illa est
 per quam nostrorum iam tandem poenitentes errorum, presentibus et erectis animis spem 220
 fidemque capessentes, prouolare in communem ei nobisque hostem debemus atque a prauis
 perniciosisque uoluptatibus ad fortia et necessariae strenuitatis opera uersi; illa armante, illa
 protegente, illa pro nobis pugnante perfringere ac debellare aduersarios compellamur, non
 per corrudentis casum pontis, at pontificis magni alacrem operam, ut et miserante iam nos
 diuina pietate cum uictore Constantino facilem et optatissimam laeti uictoriam de superatis 225
 et extinctis consequamur hostibus. Cumque iustissimis illis Moyse et Aarone atque Israelitico
 populo, sicut ipsi ab Aegyptiis, ita nos ab incumbentibus Turchis in ueri Dei et saluatoris
 nostri Iesu Christi cultum irruentibus atque infestare, peruertere et penitus abolere sacro-
 sancta unice Christianae fidei mysteria conantibus erepti ac seruati, clarissimum in gentes
 ac nationes ac triumphatissimum cum uictrice ecclesia carmen et gratulante Dei populo ca- 230
 namus: "Gloriose enim magnificatus est, equum et ascensorem deiecit in mare. Fortitudo
 nostra, et laus nostra, Deus et factus est nobis in salutem."

Mutinae Kalendas Augusti Mccccliuii.

201–217 Eusebius Pamphili, *De uita Constantini* 1.28 (422) = PG 20: 943 231–232 Ex. 15:1–2

200 dominus et domini uictor populus quoniam ipse *post* glorificatus est *add. man. alt. in marg. F* 213 dextram *O*
 214 cerneret ex cernens *corr. O* 215 corruentes *prima man. O: -tem F, ex corr. O; uid. l. 224* 226 hostibus *om. O*
 232 Deus] Dominus *Vulg.*

6. Adam de Montaldo, *Cohortatorii uersus ad papam Calixtum pro Constantinopoli* (1455/56?)

One example among dozens of the kind of short hortatory verses addressed by humanists to the pope and other political leaders urging the recovery of Constantinople and action against the Turk. Lines 19–20 (“The great fleet calls thee, its nurturing father, anxious for its promised triumphs”) suggests that the poem was written before the summer of 1456, when Cardinal Scarampo put to sea with the fleet Calixtus had collected.

MS: Preserved only in Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3567, fol. 9r-v, containing texts by Adam of Montaldo. Mbr., misc., s. XV med., II + 17 + III. Arms of Calixtus III. Round humanistic script, written in Rome, decorated initials. Probably a presentation copy for Calixtus.

BIBL: Kristeller, *Iter* 2: 321. On Adam of Montaldo, see Pertusi, *Testi inediti*, 188–89.

Ade de Montaldo Cohortatorii ad papam Calixtum pro Constantinopoli uersus.

Salue, sancte Pater, uia, dux, rex, rector et altum	
Terrarum pelagique decens, quem magnus Olympo	
Demisit miserante Deus sacrique Calistum	
Pontificem fecere patres Latiumque nitorem.	5
Semper inaccessus uiuas et semper ameris;	
Semper honoratum referant tibi saecula nomen.	
Salue, nostra salus, Danais data gloria uictis;	
Salue, sancta quies, fidei concessa ruenti;	
Salue, pacis amor, diuorum dextra iubentum;	10
Salue, honos humanus requiesque nouissima mundi.	
Ad tua confugimus cum supplice culmina uoto	
Clamantes: miserere, pater, nostrique tuique.	
Hei, nisi sancta trucidat manus horida Teucris,	
Vita necat miseros. Potes alto obrumpere bello	15
Hostis iter cunctosque Herebo defendere natos.	
Tu benedicta manus celo es demissa draconem	
Plectere; tu mundo salus expectata misello	
Terrarumque marisque decus. Te classis alentem	
Magna in promissos patrem uocat anxia triumphos	20
Teucraque barbaricis trepidat iam dextera campis.	
Clamitat imperium Constantinopolitanum	
Et gemit infelix gens circumfusa per orbem	
Promissam quae poscit opem. Si spes tua desit,	
Tota fides moritur breuibis summissa flagellis;	25
Si lentas, si animos uentura in tempora differs,	
Si mora longa nimis, coluber pessundabit urbes	
Surripietque fretum uicinaque littora demet	

2 altorum MS 11 onus humanum MS 15 almo MS: *fortasse alme legendum est*

Paulatim et tanti consurget robore Martis
Ut pro demeritis properet mors proxima nostris. 30
Quare animum uiresque tuas celosque mouentem
Suscipito; immanem uictor uicisse fereris
Marte Machometum nomenque aequabis Olympo.
Audacter capere arma iube, dum cuncta sub ausis
Gens uigilet moribunda tuis speretque potenti 35
Saluari redimique tibi qui cuncta ministras.
Interea, pater alme, uale et, dum numina possint,
Possis ad incolumem deducere tempora uitam.

7. Pseudo-Faustus, *Profetia della venuta del Gran Turco* (1456?)

This prophecy, found in a codex written in the mid-sixteenth century, seems to have been composed in Venice during the previous century, to judge by the language and contemporary references. The author of the prophecy pretends to have written it sometime before 1450 (when “Conte Francesco [Sforza]” became the duke of Milan), but it was probably written somewhat later, though before the death of Sforza in 1466. The author appears to be aware of Mehmed II’s Danube campaign against Janos Hunyadi in the summer of 1456, but makes no reference to Hunyadi’s great victory at Belgrade in July of 1456; this suggests a date of early summer 1456.

The prophecy illustrates many common hopes and fears of the period: that Christianity was entering a period of crisis and rebirth; that Christian princes were ready to betray Christendom to the Turk in return for help against their European enemies; that the pope should strip Frederick III of his imperial dignity for his failure to lead a crusade; that the Turk would convert to Christianity and unite the world again under a Christian empire; that divine intervention would be needed to free the world of a corrupt clergy.

MS: Ravenna, Biblioteca Classense 287, a miscellany of Italian poetry written s. XVI med. The text is found on fols. 9v-11r and is untitled, but has the note “reperta in antiquo codice scripta.”

<Profetia della venuta del Gran Turco>

In Christi nomine amen. Memoria como del 1450 feci principio a questo dire: como il Turcho ad ogni modo hauera Constantinopoli perhoche lo eterno Idio vol dare principio de renouare la sua santa chiesa, ma non troppo tempo credo Constantinopoli habitara l'imperatore de Christiani.

Item, lo Turcho ad ogni modo andera a Roma, ma auante che lui vegna, il fara una grandissima et possente armata per mare et per terra et andara verso el Danubio et li se fortificara cum grande prouisione de gente et de monitione, acioche Ongari ne altri Christiani non possano passare ne dare impazo a Constantinopoli.

Item, da poi che lui hara fortificato el Danubio, multiplicara l'armata per mare cum potente exercito per terra, se drizara per venire a Roma. et venita, scorrendo et dissipando li Christiani et lor citade, et multi signori Christiani per lampare la sua furia li mandara la cartha bianca, sottomendosi ala sua obedientia. et lui gli commandara che vadino al suo capo cum galee o naue ouero gente secundo la sua possibilita et continuamente multiplicara el suo exercito.

Item, el papa cercara de vnire la Christianitade, ma non sera obedito. et uedendo lui la ruina dela Christianitade, hauera lo imperatore, il quale non se mouera, ma il papa li mandara adire, che se lui non fa el suo douere como è debitore, che lui il priuara dela dignitade imperiale. per la qual cosa lo imperatore se mouera, et non fara perho niente.

Item, el papa fara prouisione de un signore de Christiani dela dignitade imperiale, se lui porra deliberare la Christianitade da tanta ruina, promettendo par el papa de mantenerlo imperatore.

Item, el papa per far il suo douere, fara una potente armata.

Item, la signoria de Venesia hauera perfecta pace.

Item, se'l conte Francesco piase bene, tutte le terre de terraferma notira a lui; se'l non, sera sempre ala obedientia de la signoria de Venesia.

Item, la signoria de Venesia fara potente armata et insieme col papa atrara nel mare Adriano et sera ale mane cum l'armata del Turcho et rompera quella per modo che pochi ne fugiranno.

Item, per terra el Turcho sera mal menado et rotto et stara a periculo grande cum quella pocha gente che li sera remasi, fugendo andra in suo paese, et questo promettera el signore Idio acioche per questo segno lui possa cognoscere et excogitare che'l dio de Christiani e vero Idio.

Item, il Turcho conuocara tutti quelli che adorino la legge de Machometto, dicendo che tutti li Christiani se vegnano adosso per ruinare lor Sanizini, unde che tutti lor faranno vna potentissima armata maggior che la prima cum grandissima prouisione.

Item, Christiani haueranno disornita una gran parte de la sua armata credendo che mai piu il Turcho possa tornare contra Christiani.

Item, quel principal signore al quale sera promiso l'imperio dal papa dimandara la dignita del imperio al papa secondo che lui hauea promiso, dicendo che lui hauea facto el suo douere.

Item, el papa rispondera che li signori Venetiani erano stati quelli che haueano vincto cum lui, et loro meritaranno la dignita imperiale.

Item, questo signore se desdignera et cerchara di fore la obedientia al papa de tutti li suoi paesi et terre, et accordarasse col Turcho, et col soccorso de la sua potentia el condura a Roma et cerchara disfare Venetiani, credendo lui che loro siano stati casone che'l papa non li habbia atteso la promesso de imperio.

Item, lo imperatore sappiando che'l papa il vorra priuare, chiamara lo consiglio exponendo molte cose contra il papa et cardinali et perseguitara li prelati, preti et frati, facendo morire una gran gente, et beati seranno quelli che non seranno chiamati chierixi.

Item, sera tolta la obedientia al papa, sera grandissima scisma in la chiesa de Dio.

Item, il Turcho vegnira cum potentissima armata et grandissimo exercito de gente, et rompera Christiani cum grandissima victoria et despogliara Venetiani de tutte le sue terre et Venesia remanera sola col populo suo. Et li gentilhomini leuaranno parte fra loro et sera gran dubbio de tagliarsi a pezzo fra loro. Ma per la bona et meritoria oratione de uno sanctissimo homo il qual è in Venesia, tosto se conduranno al accordio insieme cum bona pace.

Item, el papa sera priuato di questa vita.

Item, el Turcho andara seguitando la sua victoria fine a Roma cum tanta crudeltade quanto fusse mai vezuto in questo mondo, et maxime cum li preti, ruinando le citade et le chiesie, frati et preti et molti cardinali et prelati seranno tagliata a pizzi, et tutta la chiesa sera orphinata. Et non sera piu potentia humana che habbia e<s>peranza de poterse sottrare o liberarse da la crudelta del Turcho, et quella pocha de Christianitade che sera rimasa non sperara altro che destructione.

Item, il Turcho non contento de essere venuta a Roma solamente ma destrugere se'l porra tutto il resto de la Christianitade.

Item, aparera di segni a Roma et il Turcho stara stupefacto.

Item, lo nostro Signore misser Ihesu Christo visibilmente chiamata un sancto homo del ordine di Sancto Pietro, lo quale ha fama, ma non cognosciuta la sua sanctitude. Dio li dara uno de li suoi archangeli, visibilmente mandara llo al Turcho, dicendo che lui lo debia amaestrare in la fede christiana perche epso Idio l'ha electo imperatore de Christiani, unde il Turcho per li grandi miracole che lui vederà, per la predication de quel sancto homo, se fara il Turcho vero et perfectio Christiano et sera li dato da Dio el Spirito Sancto per ridrizare et contegnir tutta la Christianitade, et uniuersalmente tutti li suoi se faranno Christiani, e la legge de Machometto sera annullada totalmente.

Item, tutto el mondo universalmente sera contento che'l Turcho sia imperatore et questo sancto homo sia papa et pienamente hauerà obedientia per tutto il mondo. et quanto piu il Turcho sera sta<to> crudele et infidele, tanto piu sera misericordioso et fidele.

Item, quando el Turcho uedera essere destructa la chiesa de Dio, cioe per li grandi factè che semper seranno adoperati contra Christiani, etiamdio contra el Turcho predicto, et poi insieme

cum quel sancto homo che sera Papa el Turco rendera tutte le sue terre et amerano ambidui la signoria di Vinisia sopra li altri tutti signor del mondo, et dottara-li de grandissimi priuilegii et dupplichera la sua signoria.

Item, quel papa sancto mandera per li chierisi Christiani et commandara-li che vadino predicando la fede. i quali chierisi predicaranno et dirano costui essere d'Anthichristo, et stando loro obstinati in questa opinione, saranno portati visibilmente da li demonii et per questo modo se redura la giesa de Dio nel primo stato et tutti li altri infideli deuentaranno Christiani.

Item, el Turco donara terra sancta a Venetiani francata da le gabelli.

Item, lo loco del Soldano douera a Venetiani et sera bona et perfecta pace per tutto el mondo.

Item, in tanta perfectione vegniranno li Christiani che una semplice bosa estimaranno un grandissimo peccato.

Item, tutto questo misterio sera compito intra la Christianitade, cioe per tutto el mondo sera perfecta pace et longissima et questo sera nel millesimo 1595 [*ex corr.*]

Item, dico che non pasaran troppo mesi che de tutto questo misterio sera reuelato al pontificho de Vinetia, idest quel sancto homo che ho dicto di sopra che douera esser papa *et quem hic superius dixi. hoc idem Faustus ore proprio mihi protulit. Ego propria uerba sua et terminos uobis dicam, Frater Joannes Stispan ait, quem audiui[t] et approbauit. A beato fratre Alberto et hec. Deo gratias Amen.*

8. Nicolaus Perottus, *Oratio De assumptione beatae Mariae uirginis Mantuae in sacello summi pontificis* (15 August 1458)

Calls for a crusade against the Turk became a common topos in humanist sermons in the third quarter of the fifteenth century and after. Sometimes entire sermons were devoted to the theme, at other times the summons to arms was placed at the end of the sermon to provide a rousing finale. In this sermon, probably delivered on the feast of the Assumption (August 15) during the Congress of Mantua, Perotti imagines the Blessed Virgin delivering an elegant Ciceronian oration to the assembled dignitaries, exhorting them to take the Cross. The first part of the speech is omitted.

MSS: Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 5860, fols. 1r–11v (with the colophon, “scripta per me fratrem Albertum 1463, mensis Madii”). The Vatican Library also has a seventeenth-century copy of the speech (Vat. lat. 6526, fols. 54r–66v, “Diverse scritture e memorie di Monsignor Nicolò Perotti, Arcivescovo Sipontino”) taken from the earlier manuscript.

BIBL: G. Mercati, *Per la cronologia della vita e degli scritti di Niccolò Perotti* (Rome, 1925), 49–50; Kristeller, *Iter* 2: 336 and 381; Black, *Accolti*, 235.

NICOLAI PEROTTI ARCHIEPISCOPI SIPONTINI ORATIO DE ASSUNPTIONE
BEATE VIRGINIS HABITA MANTUAE IN SACELLO SUMMI PONTIFICIS.

Si quando mihi, summe pontifex, uel ingenii uires uel gratiam ac suauitatem dicendi
adesse optaui . . . /8r/ Videtis igitur quam uitam impresentia uiuit Beatissima Virgo et ut
numquam ablata est neque auferetur ab ea. Sed ipsam, queso, id ipsum de se dicentem
paulisper audiamus et ut orationem nostram ipsa claudat permittamus: *Radicaui*, inquit, *in*
populo honorificato et in partes Dei mei hereditas illius et in plenitudine sanctorum detentio mea. Radi- 5
caui, hoc est radicem misi in populo honorificato, id est in seraphico choro. Quod perinde est
ac si dicerem, ubi omnium creaturarum finitur perfectio gratiae et gloriae, ibi mea inchoat
exaltatio. Nam supra Seraphin exaltata in his radicem mitto; per me enim deinceps illumi-
nabuntur qui antehac nullo medio a Deo lumen habebant. *Et in partes Dei mei haereditas illius:*
quae est ista haereditas? Fructus e radice proueniens, hoc est praemium merito. Neque 10
enim instar seraphin contenta sum partem habere Dei mei, sed omnes partes; habet enim
dulcissimus filius meus et Deus meus Iesus Christus tres in una persona substantias, quem-
admodum in Deitate tres persone sunt in una substantia. Seraphin itaque duas illius partes
habent. Nam et diuinitate eius fruuntur ut primo obiecto et anima ipsius ut medio gratiarum
omnium. Ego uero cunctas eius partes possideo, siquidem deitati illius fruor et anima illius 15
illustror et eius corpus [corpus] amplector. Anima mea duas illius partes optinet, tertiam
corpus secundum quam canebat Salamon: “Leua eius sub capite meo et dextera illius amplex-
abitur me.” *Et in plenitudine sanctorum detentio mea* quia sola nunc omni genere gaudii exulto
anima et corpore, diuinitate et humanitate filii et Dei mei, qui solus est plenitudo sanctorum,
qui eos facere potest anima corporeque beatos. Hec est igitur uita mea, hec beatitudo mea, 20

4–5 Sirach 24:16

15 si quid et MS

quae a me auferri non potest. Ego apud filium meum continue uersor, ipso fruor, cum ipso habito, pro uobis ipsum precor, et, ut ipse continue pro uobis ostendit Patri latus et <u>ulnera, ita ego ostendo pectus et ubera.

“Vos uero quid agitis, o uiri Christiani, o popule Dei, o sanguis illustris sanguine filii mei redemptor<is>? Quid, inquam, agitis? Quid ignauia desidiaque corporis? Quid ita in me, quid ita in filium meum ingrati estis? Filius meus Yhesus de caelo descendit; muliebre corpus ingressus est; carnem assumpsit; capi, flagellari, mori uoluit pro salute generis humani, pro populo suo, pro suis filiis. Vos uero eius populum, uos eius filios, hoc est Christianos, a foedissimis et crudelissimis barbaris c<r>ucis hostibus capi, uexari, trucidari permittitis. Imminent undique sponsae eius ecclesiae pericula; periclitatur Christiana religio; imagines filii mei et meae apud barbaros ludibrio habentur; cruces et uexilla ecclesiarum uolutantur in coeno. Vos uero inertia pectora dormitis, uos ridetis et, quasi nihil ad uos ista mala pertineant, contemnitis. O crudeles et longe crudeliores barbaris, longe Iudeis ipsis immaniores! Illi semel filium meum Iesum quem uix norant occiderunt; uos uero non una morte contenti saluatorem uestrum quotidie, quotidie occiditis! Occiditis enim Christum quotiens aliquem ex suis per ignauiam aut impietatem occidi permittitis. Nonne igitur ingrati estis uel potius impii et parricidae? Summa certe impietas et quedam carnificina crudelitas est non adiuuare miseros, erigere calamitosos, tueri pro fide Christiana oppressos. Quo enim confugient fideles? quem implorabunt? qua spe denique ut uiuere uelint tenebuntur, si uos eos deseritis? Exurgite, exurgite aliquando atque excitamini Christiani principes et populi; occurrите rabiosis ac uoracibus lupis qui iustas simplicesque animas excruciant et quadam sanguinaria crudelitate persequuntur. Quod si ita impii estis ut uos non moueat proximorum calamitas, ut nullis flectamini commiserationibus in tanta Christianorum uexatione, direptione, interitu, caede, cum agros uastari, urbes in crudelissimorum barbarorum potestatem redigi, coniuges a complexibus uiuorum rapi, liberos de gremiis parentum extorqueri, pretiosam suppellectilem asportari, tecta ignibus conflagrari, corpora cedi, cesa feris obiici, in sepulta uocari, omnia denique gemitu fletuque redundari intelligitis, moueat uos saltem pia recordatio dilectissimi filii mei Iesu, de cuius re agitur, pro cuius fide decernitur, cuius de gloria certatur. Reuocate in memoriam diem illum quo ex me, humili muliercula, carnem assumere ut homo fieret uoluit qui rex erat caeli et terrae. Repetite quomodo natus pro caelo in presepe reclinari uoluit, pro stellarum corona panniculis inuolui, pro seruorum multitudine bouem asinumque habere, pro magnificentia astantium Mariae et Ioseph presentia frui. Recensere amorem illum ineffabilem quo uos dum uixit prosequutus fuit qui uos (ut Hieronimus ait) nimia caritate dilexit. An mente excidit quomodo ille pro uobis inopiam, famem, sitim, estum, algorem, uigilias et reliquas uitae angustias substulit? Numquid obliuisci potestis captum illum, detentum, ligatum, derisum, abiectum, maculatum sputis, spinis coronatum, lancea santiatum, aceto et felle potatum et tandem totum afflictum, in cruce crudelissime fixum pro uobis? Constitutus fuit capite eius inclinato ad uos obsculandum, manibus extensis ad amplectendum, pedibus confixis ad uobiscum manendum, to<to> corpore exposito ad uos redimendum.

“Reuocate, reuocate inquam in memoriam, Christiani principes ac populi, tantam mei dulcissimi filii erga uos benignitatem, et, ut gratos decet, totis uiribus gratiam rependite; immanissimum ac foedissimum monstrum ex agro eius expellite; depopulatorem, uexatorem, praedonem, hostem populorum suorum exterminate, fugate proiicite; perditorem fidei Christiane terra marique persequemini; hominem nequam, turpem, improbum omnibus flagitiis contaminatum meritis suppliciiis afficite; paci, ocio, concordiae, libertati, saluti

denique Christianorum prouidete. Si uero uel ita ingrati estis ut haec possitis obliuisci uel ita impii ut contemnatis, salutem uobis ipsis consulite; uestrae uestrorumque saluti prospicite; nolite putare propterea uos tu<t>os esse, quod serpens ille et quasi uorago ac scopulus Christiane rei publice longe a uestris finibus grassatur: serpet, mihi credite, hoc malum longius quam putatis et tandem uos quoque opprimet, nisi nunc re integra prouideritis, nullaue intra exiguum tempus agri uestri gleba libera remanebit. Quid ergo nunc commemorem quantam haec uestra tarditas seu lentitudo siue ignauia superioribus temporibus iacturam intulerit rebus Christianorum? Uniuersus fere orbis Christi olim religione gloriabatur. Surrexit deinde Maumethus Arabs qui omnem patriam suam a uera fide diuertit. Postea paulatim incuria ac negligentia uestra factum est ut omnis Aegyptus, Sirya et tota subinde Asia eundem errorem sit secuta. Idem fecere deinde Libyae atque Hyspaniae populi, quin etiam ea pars Europae quae ad orientem uergit non potuit Christianam religionem tueri: Cappadocia, Bythinia, Ponto, Troade totaque Minore Asia occupata, Turca, gens effera Graecas omnes urbes Atticae, Boetie, Achaie, Macedoniae et Tracia ditioni sue subegit. Paucis uero ante annis—heu! quomodo hoc sine lachrimis audire poteritis?—uetustissima urbs Byzantium, totius orientis caput, imperatoria sedes, uobis desidibus ac malum proximorum quasi nihil ad uos pertinens ridentibus, imperatori Turcorum, homini nefario ac crudeli uel potius impurissime atque intemperatissime pecudi, subiecta est. O miserum et infoelicem illum diem cum tot Christianorum milia in spurcissimas infidelium manus deuen- erit! Quot magni et praeclari uiri in bello caesi sunt? Quot post bellum crudeliter obtruncati? Quot in turpissimam seruitutem redacti? Vexari ciues acerbissime in conspectu suo coniuges suos uidebant, uiolari ac prostitui uirgines, diripi pueros, omnia denique ferro ignique uastari, ciuitatem non modo exhauriri bonis, sed et nepharias contumelias turpitudinesque subire, imperatorem ipsum Graeciae quasi uictimam impie trucidari. O triste plane acerbumque funus! O morte ipsa mortis genus indignius! Quid dicam de templo illo nulli toto orbe terrarum comparabili? Heu, heu! obscenis nunc seruit caerimoniis, factum est arx nephandissimorum hominum, receptaculum spurcissimarum beluarum, bustum totius fidei, pietatis ac religionis! Quid de Peloponneso loquar, quae postea pari immanitate barbarorum ac negligentia uestra in seruitutem redacta fuit? Quid de Caramania et Seruia et Illyria? Non omnibus est oppidorum turpis amissio, populorum direptio, agrorum depopulatio? Omnes iam finitimas urbes barbarus contriuet, compulit, domuit. Sic omnia paulatim labuntur et ruunt. Christiani uero principes inter se odiis certant, se inuicem opprimunt. O scelus, o pestis! qua ui uocis, qua grauitate uerborum, quo animi dolore hoc dicam? Video ego ex altitudine troni in quo constituta sum, uideo nonnullos Christianos principes Turcorum auxilia aduersus Christianos a quibus uersantur implorantes; uideo imperatorem ipsum Turcorum iam iam oculis, superciliis, fronte, toto denique corpore ei rei incumbentem; uideo iam ut multitudine<m> hominum armauit, coegit, instruxit. Proh Deum atque hominem Yhesum! in tantamne deueniemus temporum calamitatem et rabiem?

“Ego igitur hoc uociferor, ego omnes homines, ego Yhesum Christum filium meum testor, ego maxima uoce ut omnes audire possitis uos moneo, hortor, praedico, denuntio, dum potestis, dum licet, dum res integra est, prouidete, praecipitanti populo Christiano subuenite, demersum erigite, resistite barbarorum furori, miseremini domus uestrae et liberorum uestrorum ad quos hae<c> calamitas, nisi prouideritis, deuentura est.

“Aspicate senem illum, filii mei Yhesu Christi uicarium, qui tam iniqua ualitudine conflictatur et longo ac pertinaci detinetur morbo. Hic confectus senectute, afflictus aegritudine et membris omnibus debilitatus, relictam patriam, dimissam imperii sedem, quietis ac suae salutis

immemor, libertatem dumtaxat Christianorum sitiens huc ad uos uenit, tot labores sustulit qui etiam robustissimis magni uiderentur, in mortis sese apertissimo discrimine posuit. 'O mors,' inquit, 'preclarissima! O mors omni aevo a me optanda, modo populos meos liberos 115 atque incolumes relinquam!' Is prompto ac animo parato est, si per caeteros non steterit, omnes uires suas, omnes fortunas, imperium omne et ipsa insignia atque infulas ponere pro salute ac libertate rei publice. Quod si uos, Christiani principes ac populi, tali exemplo non mouebimini, si non flectemini hortatu, monitis, precibus sanctissimi patris uestri, nonne 120 foedissimas sempiternae turpitudinis notas subibitis? Cogitate mentibus uestris patriam cuiusque uestrum sanctissimam, qua nihil dulcius, nihil carius in hac uita esse potest, ante pedes uestros orando prostratam esse ut eam a sceleratorum manibus conseruetis. Versetur uobis ante oculos rabidus barbarorum furor et inaudita crudelitas; quam dulce sit libertatis nomen attendite; cernite animo miseros atque insepultos acruos ciuium uestrorum; proponite uobis tum lamentationes matrum familias, tum uirginum fugam ac puerorum uexationem. 125 Omnes hoc facite reges, principes; ecclesiastici, seculares; summi, medii, infimi; ciues, peregrini; uiri, mulieres; serui, liberi, dummodo Christiani, et, si qua uos affectio mouet, conspirete cum uicario filii mei, consentite cum patre uestro, inhaerete pontifici maximo, communem rem publicam communi studio atque amore defendite. Non deseret uos filius meus in se sperantes, non obliuisceret populi sui. Ego interim continuus apud eum precibus in- 130 sistam, ut animum istum tibi, Pie pontifex, conseruet; animo isti tempus quoque longissimum prebeat, quod facere dignetur qui regnat in secula seculorum. Amen."

9. Anonymous prophecy found in a humanistic manuscript (1458–64)

This prophecy is found on the back flyleaf of a manuscript written by Jacopo Ammanati Piccolomini, the cardinal nephew of Pius II, who had studied with the great humanist schoolmaster Guarino Veronese and had himself taught humanities in Florence.

MS: Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 5994.

BIBL: Kristeller, *Iter* 2: 378; M. Moli Frigola, "Jakobo," in *Scrittura: Biblioteche e Stampa a Roma nel Quattrocento: Aspetti e problemi*, ed. C. Bianca et al. (Rome, 1980), 190.

Tu lector in primis nota quod alienum est a fide. "Et fatte beffe de lui".*

Sanctissimo domino nostro Pio pape secundo transmissum per Serenissimum Regem Francorum.

Anno 1466: Roma papa carebit.

Anno 1467: Multi fame peribunt.

Anno 1468: Omnis clarus interficietur.

Anno 1469: Obsessio erit per Turchum a Rodio usque Romam per Portam Latinam, et obsessa Roma Rex Francorum Turchum constringet in fugam usque Iherusalem ad sepulchrum Christi.

Anno 1470: Turchus superatus et uictus, fiet papa quidam heremita electus ab angelo sub arbore siccha. Missam celeb<r>abit et tunc arbor illa florebit.**

Anno 1471: Tempore ipsius pape fiet unio totius Christianitatis.

Anno 1472: Dehinc Rex Francorum morietur.

*Matt. 27:29; Marc. 15:20 **cf. Ezech. 17:24

10. Petrus Bravus Veronensis, *Inuectiua in Andronicum Callistum* (1460s?)

This invective, in addition to providing new biographical data on the little-known Byzantine emigré Andronicus Callistus, illustrates Western prejudices against the Greeks, especially the reputation of the latter for cultural arrogance, heterodoxy, and sexual perversion.

MS: Padua, Museo Civico, MS B.P. 1223, fols. 20v–21v.

BIBL: Kristeller, *Iter* 2: 23.

Inuectiua Petri Braui Veronensis in quendam Greculum Andronicum latini nominis impugnatores.

Cum tuas nuper, Andronice, uir omnium scelestissime, nugas nescio quas perlegerim quibus pro innata tibi, ut ceteris Grecis, temeritate in tantam rabiem prorupisti ut uenerandum nomen latinum impugnare conatus fueris, tulissem id quidem iniquo animo nisi Graecorum naturam iam diu perspectam et cognitam habuissem, quae semper in latinos principes et dominos suos parata est male dicere. Sed quoniam temeritatis et superbiae uestrae toti terrarum orbi talia dedistis documenta ut neminem prorsus communis hic morbus uester lateat, ignoscendum uobis potius quam succensendum latina requirit humanitas. Non ea tamen lege tibi, Graecule, pepercisse uelim ut (etsi tuae insolentiae me conferre indignum putem) loquacitatem tuam nihilominus mea pro parte non represserim. 5 10

Et quid tibi, homo, nihil est quod tantopere Latinos tanquam dignae miseriae tuae auctores accuses? Quid illi tibi, quod non tua perfidia poposcerit, incommodi attulerint? Ais enim tu: “hominem illi uere Christicolam et a fide catholica nequaquam penitus dissentientem captum ceco carceri detruxerunt; detrusum ita uerberibus ceciderunt, ut morbus illi caducus superuenerit. Et hec quidem beneficia illa sunt quae Graecis, ipsis religionis exultoribus, bonarum artium ac omnium inuentoribus, reprehenduntur.” 15

Certe tu uere Christicola et catholicus es. Hoc me hercle tua testantur uerba, quibus ita ueram fidem nostram predicabas ut quo te duxisse latinos quereris, eo te ipsum nugis tuis a ueritate penitus alienis contuleris. Quodque peius est, in falso tuo proposito hactenus inter uerba et cruciatus perstiteris. Quo fit ut magis tibi et petulantiae tuae ignoscendum putem, si garrulis et ineptis quibusdam uerbis latinum genus lacerare non dubitaueris, quandoquidem Christus noster, cuius sacratissimam et integerrimam fidem tuis caninis moribus lacerare ausus es, te superstitem patitur et terra ipsa te factoris sui hostem publicum ex hominum oculis non absorbet. 20 25

Horum autem quae merito pateris malorum non tibi, ut affirmas, Latini causa fuere nec in eos tam precipiti et petulanti lingua maledicere debueras, uerum fedissima scelera tua, uel te potius ipsum (qui ad ea perpetranda quam facile currebas) ac perfidiam et hereticam prauitatem tuam tibi accusandum erat, ob que in huiusmodi non immerito calamitates incidisti. Et, nisi corruptam hactenus et hereticis opinionibus irretitam mentem omni falsitate penitus exueris, duriora (mihi crede) supplicia tibi subeundum erit. Nunc inter rosas ac lilia iocaris; audes preterea Graecos religionis excultores ac bonarum artium et omnium inuentores appellare. Hoc profecto tibi lubenter concesserim: illos semper religionis — sed heretice et scismatice — fuisse ueros excultores, bonarum artium a nonnullis Grecorum 30

optimis uiris inuentarum corruptores et omnium demum scelerum inuentores, quod et Virgilius noster testatur: *Scelerumque inuentor Ulixes*. 35

Hec tibi numquam negauerim. Compertum enim omnibus est quantum ecclesiae sacrosancte Romane rebelles semper extitistis, quae sepenumero, cum genus uestrum caeteris fidelibus aggregare uoluerit, uos hereses fallacesque opiniones uestras pro uiribus semper defensare studuistis. Que quidem omnia uos barbaros, non aut Latinos ut ais, esse 40 comprobant.

Quamobrem et iusto Dei iudicio factum est ut, diruta Constantinopolis urbe non sine preu<i>a uestri generis strage, huc atque illuc uagantes pertinaciae uestre penas luatis. Neque hoc quoque tam dirum supplicium obstinatas mentes uestras adhuc a falsis sententiis ita deterrere potuit, quin ueluti canes ad uomitum redeatis. Tu uero inprimis, asine uerberande, pestiferum perfidiae tuae uirus in nostros uere fideles conflare ausus es. Et cum in eum locum incidisti ubi pro flagitiis tuis rationem reddere cogeris, non dubitas ea falso Latinis crimina dare que ab ipsis tibi et merito quidem obiiciunt. Hic certe optimus est ueniae impetrandae modus, hoc penitentiae tuae potissimum est argumentum. Consultius quidem tibi consuluisse si loquacem linguam tuam compescuisses, apud nos praesertim qui scelerum 50 tuorum sarcinas iam diu calemus. Scimus inconstantiam, scimus intemperantiam et ebrietatem tuam, nec nos fugit quam detestando morbo illo labores, quo et caeteri Graeci. Ἀνδρόνικοῦ quidem tibi nomen est, a cuius nominis ethimologia tua penitus abhorret natura. Id enim (ut nosti) hominum uictor latine sonat. Melius autem et significantius tibi Παῖδόνικοῦ affuisset. Tu enim pueros potius quam homines uincere solitus est. 55

Non libet ulterius progredi, nec enim tua inpresentiarum recensurus flagitia insurrexi. Sed hec ad te pauca scripsisse uelim ut et tamquam nostri moniciunculam suscipias et accuratissime deinceps caueas ne calamitates, quae tuis obscenis facinoribus respondent, te impium et iniquum latini nominis accusatorem faciant. Quod si contigerit, uolumina (mihi crede) tuorum scelerum aperiemus. Finem igitur scribendi faciam, si te prius hoc unum 60 monuero, ut, etsi pro summa tua impudentia ne nimia quidem Latinorum latratus tuos maledicos, non propria illis, existimandum effugere uoluisti, hoc modestiae meae tribuas, quod uerba mea non in omnes Graecorum (credo enim ex eis nonnullos reperiri bonos), sed in flagiciosos et tui similes fecisse uelim. Vale. [n.d.]

36 Verg. *Aen.* 2.164

61 nimium *MS* 62 existimandos *MS*

11. Pseudo-Mehmed II, Letter to Ferrante I of Aragon, with reply (after 1470)

These forged letters, written in fifteenth-century chancery Latin, may have been written by a humanist who wanted to counter the widespread rumors that Ferrante of Aragon was colluding with the Turks in order to undermine his rivals, the Venetians. If this is the case, they were probably written soon after the fall of Negroponte in 1470, when the issue was still a live one, but (obviously) before the Turkish attack on Otranto in 1480. In their attempt to influence public perceptions of Aragonese foreign policy, they recall the form letters confected by Laudivius in the pseudonymous *Epistulae Magni Turci* (see above, note 38).

MS: Rome, Biblioteca Angelica, MS 141, fol. 84r–v.

BIBL: E. Narducci, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum praeter Graecos et Orientales in Bibliotheca Angelica olim coenobii sancti Augustini de Urbe* (Rome, 1893), 73–77.

Malchmeth Dei gratia Turchie Greciaequae imperator etc. serenissimo et illustrissimo domino Ferdinando regi Sicilie et tamquam filio karissimo salutem, etc.

Scire facere uictoriam nostram nostris amicis consuetudo nostra est. Ideoque quia sci-
mus Dominationem uestram gaudere de uictoriis nostris mittimus numptium nostrum Cha-
riadinum ad referendum Maiestati vestre de preda insule Negropontis. Cui aliqua commis- 5
imus ut referat Dominationi vestre, cui fidem dare placeat.

Datum Negropontis die XX lune. Machumeti Hegire anno DCCCLXXV.

7 Machumeti Hegire anno DCCCLXXV] Machumare anno cccliiv MS

Serenissimo et illustrissimo domino Machmeth imperatori Turchie Ferdinandus Dei gratia rex Sicilie Ierusalem Ungarie salutem.

Accepimus litteras Serenitatis Vestre quas ad nos misit cum eius legato ac muneribus
per easque numptiauit expugnationem Negropontis et de ea nobiscum gratulatur. Quod ad
legatum et munera attinet, non ea nobis ingrata fuere. Etenim cum superioribus annis 5
significatum nobis esset subditos nostros a Vestra Serenitate bene tractari, nosque per lega-
tum suum uisitasset, non indecorum uisum fuit ad eandem pariter legatum nostrum mit-
tere. Et id amicitiae ius cum eadem seruare quod salua nostra dignitate et fide fieri possit.
Verum cum Vestra Serenitas bellum gerat contra Cristianos et maxime contra Venetos
amicos nostros summaque beneuolentia deuinctos, non possumus non solum cum eadem 10
Vestra Serenitate amicitiam seruare, sed decernimus ut regem Christianum decet totis uiri-
bus eam offendere ut equum est et pro seruanda fide, seruandis amicis seruandaque Chris-
tiana sanctissima religione. Cuius rei initium dedimus, quoniam misimus triremes nostras
auxiliares Venetis. Neque Serenitas Vestra persuadere debet nos defuturos Christiane reli-
gioni, cuius sumus obseruantissimi, aut Venetorum amicitiae, quos unice diligimus. Mirari 15
itaque cogimur quod Vestra Serenitas nobiscum congratuletur de expugnatione Ne-
gropontis que nobis molestissima fuit.

Datum Neapoli die III Septembris MCCCLXX.

7 nostrum *in marg.* 11 decernimus *in marg.* 12 non ante eam *del. scriba* 14 si post Neque *delevi*

12. Pseudo-Mehmed II, *Responsio Magni Turci ad Pium summum pontificem* (before 1474)

This text, preserved in a few manuscripts and one very rare incunabulum, presents itself as a reply of the Great Turk to a poem of Pius II. In that poem the pope declares war on the Turk and expostulates with those who identify the Turks with the Trojans. (The text of Pius' poem is published in Cugnoni, *Aeneae Silvii Piccolomini*, 368). The two texts together form a poetic parallel to the better-known pair of letters supposedly exchanged between Pius II and pseudo-Mehmed, found in numerous incunabula (see above, note 97). The pseudo-Mehmed text asserts the descent of the Turks from the Trojans, and declares the Turk's intention of capturing "Trojan" Italy. The text is ambiguous, or rather contradictory, on the Turk's intentions with respect to Christianity: in line 6, Mehmed asks Muhammad to let him destroy "the false faith of Christ," while in lines 43–44 he says he does not want to destroy Christ so long as he can recover "the kingdoms of the earlier Trojans."

MSS: Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Lat. Qu. 174, fols. 84r–85r; Brno, Státní Archiv E6, Benediktini Rajhrad sign H d 371, fols. 100v–101; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Nouv. acq. lat. 1882, fol. 20r–v; Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana C 120, fols. 88v–89r; Verona, Biblioteca Civica, MS 1393, fols. 39v–40r.

EDN: Hain 178 = IGI 7764 [Padua: Leonhard Achates, before 1474]. This edition is based on a copy of the incunabulum at the Biblioteca Angelica in Rome, Inc. 23/4, checked against the Paris manuscript (**P**), and the Berlin manuscript (**B**), kindly collated for me, respectively, by Profs. Virginia Brown and Anthony Grafton.

BIBL: L. Bertalot, *Initia Humanistica Latina* (Tübingen, 1985), 149, no. 3242.

Responsio Magni Turci ad Pium summum pontificem

Maumethee pater, iam iam mihi consule queso;
 Indixere Pii carmina bella mihi.
 Da pater ut solitos liceat gestare triumphos
 Ut duce me superent iam tua signa crucem.
 Da me Christicolas foelici uincere Marte 5
 Ut pereat Christi denique falsa fides.
 Illi nunc Christum sacris uenerantur in aris
 Qui mutant nomen: dicitur atque Iesus.
 Sed nos te solum longo ueneramur in euo,
 Te solum colimus, solus et ipse places. 10
 Ergo tui si qua est populi te cura precantis,
 Nomine da Christum uincere posse tuo.
 Quid, Pie, carminibus tu Maumethea superbis
 Obiurgas? uestro est uerior ille deus.

Titulus: Epistola turchi ad summum pontificem *P:* Carmina composita per magnum Teucrum *B* 1 Maumete *ed.*
 2 Pii] michi *P* *lin.* 4–5 *om. P* 4 *Ut scripsi: cf. lin.* 6 6 *Ut]* *P* Christus *P* 8 *mutat ed.* 10 *colimur P, corr. ut*
vid. ex colimus 11 *qua populi tibi est c. p. B* *te]* *tua P* 12 *Numine P: Lumine B* 14 *Objurgar B* *est om. B*

Mille tibi uellem que nunc miracula possem 15
 Scribere, ni passim numina nota forent.
 Abstinit uino; pariter gens uina recusat
 Nostra quidem; lymphas spernere uestra solet.
 Sic Bacchum colitis miseri, sic numina Christi
 Fallitis; ha! plures non decet esse deos. 20
 Tu nos Dardanei generis posse esse negasti;
 Me Turchum tandem dicere non puduit.
 Sum Theucer, Theucro natus de sanguine. Turcum
 Quid, Pie, meque tuo carmine sepe uocas?
 Dic mihi, quis Theucer fuerit, quis denique Turcus? 25
 Troiani fuimus, quicquid, amice, putas.
 Reliquie fuimus Priami quas perdere Graii
 Crudeli bello non potuere duces.
 Dardanide quanto fuerint cum Marte potentes
 Historie referunt: hystoriasque lege. 30
 Non tulit Argiuos populum superare potentes
 Dardanidum magne protinus ira dee.
 Sed quis sim, nosces: fixo stat pectore firmum
 Consilium ut noscas que sit origo mihi.
 Ergo age tu, bello fortis accinge cohortes; 35
 Viribus occurrent nam mea signa tuis,
 Ausoniasque petam non longo tempore terras.
 Numina tunc uenient prospera cuncta mihi.
 Carminibus fortasse putas inferre pauorem:
 Carmina nulla quidem, sed tibi tella dabo. 40
 Tu pugna metris, at nos uictricibus armis:
 Temptemus quid Mars, quid tua Musa ualet.
 Perdere non cupio Christum, sed regna priorum
 Dardanidum repetam que tua sceptrum tenent.
 Aeneas mediis fuerat qui elapsus Achiuis 45
 Tros urbem Romam condidit in Lacio,
 Romoleasque arces repetam; instantibus ense
 Donabo mortem gentibus atque face.
 Nec deerunt uires, miles, nec dextra mucroque.
 Et Maumetheus fortia tella dabit 50
 Italieque fluent tunc flumina cuncta cruore,
 Ni Maumetheo plus queat ipse Iesus.

Finis

15 nunc qui *ed.*: numquam *B* 16 stringere *P* ni] inque *ed.* possim nomina *B* ferruit *P*, ferant *post corr.*
 17 uina] nostro *B* 18 Nostra] Vina *B* vestra] nostra *B* 19 Sic . . . sic] Si . . . si *B* miserum *P* 20 decet] licet *BP*
 21 draconi *B* post *ed.* 22 tandem] quidem *P* 23 Theucroque *ed.*: de Teucro *B* de *om. ed.* Tuscum *ed.* 24 tuo] uocas
ed. sepe uocas] nempe tuo *ed.* 25 Tuscus *ed.* 26 sumus *P* 29 fuimus *ante* quanto *ed.* cum] tam *P* 30 historie]
 historias *P* 32 Dardanium *B*: Dardaneum *ed.* 33 quid *B* stant *P* 35 tuo *ed.* bello tu *B* fortes *ed.*: forte *P*
 36 occurrentque uiris *B* 38 tunc] tum *BP* cuncta *om. ed.* 39 pudorem *P* 40 bella *B* 41 pugnam *BP* 42 temptamus
ed.: tentamus *B* 43 sed] si *ed.* 44 septa *P* 45 fuerat *om. ed.* 47 astantibus *B* 48 atque face *scripsi*] que fere *ed.*: ipse
 ferram (*scil. feram*) *fort. recte P*: ipsa terram *B* 49 uires *om. P*: uiros *B* 51 Italico *B* tum *BP* 52 ille *P* Christus *ed.*, *P*